Susquehanna University
Selinsgrove, Pa.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXXVII.

AUGUST, 1901.

THE INSULAR CASES.

BY GEORGE F. EDMUNDS, FORMERLY UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM VERMONT.

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." (Constitution of the United States, Article VI.)

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." (Amendment X., Constitution of the United States.)

Two recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have compelled renewed and solicitous attention to the fundamental and constitutional relations, for all time to come, of Congress and the President to the inhabitants of New Mexico, Arizona, Alaska, Oklahoma, the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands, as well as to all other citizens, subjects and aliens(and slaves in the Philippines) who may happen not to be within the geographical boundaries of any *State* of the United States, but still within the political dominion of our country in some of its Territories. Happily for the inhabitants of Ohio, and of the great and prospering States of the Northwest living under the sway and protection of both National and State

Copyright, 1901, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constitutions, their fair lands have ceased to be Territories, and they are delivered from the despotism, however benevolent and wise, of a Congress in which they could have no vote, and whose power over their lives, liberties, fortunes and happiness was restrained by no constitutional barrier. Probably, an absolute despotism is the best imaginable government, provided the ruler is the complete embodiment of all wisdom and virtue. But in all the history and experience of the world, no such ruler, or body of rulers, or any resembling him or them, have ever appeared. A conclave of despots has almost always been found to be worse than a single despot. The French Directory was worse than the King it had slain, and the Commune was worse than Napoleon III. Was the Declaration of Independence of 1776 a mere phantasm of the founders of the Republic putting forth fantastic fictions? If so, the people of the United States ought, logically, to be now a Crown Colony of Great Britain, awaiting, like the Boers, the good pleasure of Parliament and the King for such measure of liberty and justice as their masters might be pleased to bestow upon them.

Differing from the condition of a State legislature, the powers of Congress are such, and such only, as the Constitution has imparted to it. It did not create the Constitution, but, on the contrary, the Constitution created it and endowed it with all, and the only, powers it possesses. "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, etc.," is the very first provision of the Constitution. These powers are then enumerated and distributed; and, to guard against misconstruction and usurpation, special prohibitions were established, and the whole mass of powers not so delegated were expressly "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." No general sovereign power, such as is attributed to the ruler or people of a single and separate State, was conferred on Congress or the President. This is in distinct contrast with the powers of the legislatures of the several States, which are sovereign and supreme, except in so far as their own written Constitutions and the Constitution of the United States limit them.

The foregoing observations set forth briefly what has been, during the whole period of our national existence until now, considered to be axiomatic—the rock on which the edifice of just liberty and order should stand indestructible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first of the two cases referred to in the opening of this article is De Lima *versus* Bidwell. In this it was held that instantly upon the cession of Porto Rico by Spain to the United States, that Island became a part of the United States, and that duties could not be lawfully exacted upon merchandise coming thence to the United States after the cession and before the so-called Foraker Act was passed by Congress.

The second case referred to is Downes *versus* Bidwell. In this case it was held that Congress could constitutionally impose duties not uniform throughout the United States, and which were discriminative, upon merchandise coming from Porto Rico to the United States after the Foraker Act providing for such duties was passed, for the reason that Porto Rico is not a part of the United States within the meaning of the revenue clauses of the Constitution.

The decision in the first mentioned case was delivered by Mr. Justice Brown, and concurred in by the Chief Justice, and Justices Harlan, Brewer and Peckham, and dissented from by Justices Gray, Shiras, White and McKenna. The decision in the second case was also delivered by Mr. Justice Brown, and concurred in by Justices Gray, Shiras, White and McKenna, for reasons (as stated by Mr. Justice White) "different from, if not in conflict with, those expressed" in the opinion of Mr. Justice Brown; and it was dissented from by the Chief Justice, and Justices Harlan, Brewer and Peckham.

However variant in principle and deduction these two controlling decisions and the reasons announced therefor may be, and however grave the consequences that may flow from them, and especially from the latter one, in the future, they must now stand and must continue to stand unless they should be reviewed and one or the other of them overruled by the same great tribunal, whose judgments must command the respectful acquiescence of all good citizens (and particularly of the citizens of the respective States whose equality of burdens and of rights under the Constitution are still secure from Congressional injustice, so long as they stay at home and have nothing to do with the Territories), as determining what are the powers of Congress over the people of all the Territories of the United States, present and to come.

Thus, ceded territories become absolutely a part of the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, but their citizens are not entitled to *some* of the protections of the Constitution against unbridled power. Whether they are entitled to *any* constitutional protection, or are solely dependent on legislative will for the security of rights which the Constitution makes sacred to the people of the several States against invasion by Congress, remains to be determined. Among these rights named in the Constitution are:

The right to have representatives and direct taxes apportioned according to numbers;

The right to have all duties, imposts and excises uniform throughout the United States;

The right that no appropriation of money for the support of armies shall be for a longer term than two years;

The right that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended, unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it;

The right that no bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law shall be passed;

The right that no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to census enumeration;

The right that no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State;

The right that no preference shall be given, by any regulation of commerce or revenue, to the ports of one State over those of another, nor that vessels bound to or from one State shall be obliged to enter, clear or pay duties in another;

The right that no person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses, and that no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted;

The right to be free from laws respecting an establishment of religion;

The right to the free exercise of religion;

The right to freedom of speech and of the press;

The right peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances;

The right to keep and bear arms;

The right to be free from the quartering of soldiers in their houses in time of peace, and in time of war only in a manner prescribed by law;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures;

The right to be secure from certain criminal prosecutions unless on the indictment of a grand jury;

The right not to be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy;

The right not to be compelled in criminal cases to be witnesses against themselves;

The right in criminal cases to be informed of the nature and cause of accusation, and to be confronted with the witnesses against them, and to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in their favor, and to have the assistance of counsel;

The right to be free from cruel and unusual punishments.

This enumeration of rights comprises a large part of those understood by the framers of the Constitution, and by the people and States adopting it, to be among the fundamental and inalienable rights of man living in civilized and organized communities. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and of the first body of amendments, the Government of the United States was in possession and control of the Territory northwest of the Ohio River, which it had acquired by cession from those States which had before claimed dominion over it. The same Constitution that declared and secured these rights declared that Congress should have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States. Can it be possible that this grant of power was not intended to be, and was not in fact and law, subject to these same limitations and prohibitions imposed upon Congress by language unrestrained and in no way limited to particular parts of the one country over which the Government had become supreme, and for the government of which the departments of the legislature, the executive and the judiciary were established? If the people residing in the several States so needed the securities above mentioned, notwithstanding the protection the governments of their respective States might give them, by so much the more would the people of the Territory then under the dominion of the United States need them. Can it be that as to them Congress was superior to the Constitution, and could deny to them the rights which, were they inhabitants of any of the States, Congress could not invade?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is true that it has long been held that, in respect of the life tenure of judges mentioned in the Constitution, that tenure was not required in the Territorial courts; but it may be fairly contended from the judicial article of the Constitution that the autonomy of the judicial establishment therein described was to be exercised within the boundaries of the respective States, and that in the government of the Territories the official tenure of the judges of courts established therein, under the power to make all needful rules and regulations, need not be for life. But, however this may be, it can furnish little, if any, reason for expanding a mistaken construction of one clause of the Constitution to all the others.

Unequal taxation is, perhaps, the most galling and destructive of all forms of tyranny. If the uniformity of taxation clause of the Constitution had been omitted, and Congress should now impose a tax discriminating against the people of some State or group of States, what would be likely to happen? What ought to happen? Are the principles of justice and the necessity for constitutional protection against abuses of sovereign power in and by the same government superfluous and illogical beyond the physical boundary of the States? These and many other like questions force themselves into the pathway of what its devotees hoped to be our benevolent and Christian imperial progress, carrying with it liberty, civilization and true religion. If the written Constitution of our country is clearly not adequate to these ends, it is not the fault of the judiciary; the responsibility is elsewhere. The paradox of a sovereignty created and existing only by the Constitution, but to be exercised contrary to its provisions, may be found to be best suited to the needs of twentieth century civilization; but this is more than doubtful. Doubtless, it is highly convenient, as it always has been, to rulers having aggressive policies, good or bad, to carry on, that no barriers to their free exercise exist. Thus, the colonial charters before the Revolution were perverted, suspended or revoked, as the will of a weak and wicked king, or the passions of party, or selfish motives of trade, dictated; and, following such precedents, as is reported, the charter of Cape Colony has just been suspended. And thus Congress, thinking itself free from any constitutional constraint, has thought it fit to enact discriminative measures affecting intrinsic rights and interests of our citizens and the other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people of Porto Rico and Hawaii, and has imposed conditions upon the people of Cuba not hinted at in the solemn, public declaration made by Congress, when the great drama out of which have grown all our present embarrassments opened. And in the Philippines, a government is being instituted and laws decreed by the President alone, in his sole discretion, under an authority granted him by Congress for that purpose—and, in legal effect, a power to continue in him until he himself shall consent to surrender it, or two-thirds of each House shall take it from him. The theory and standards of a people's government must have greatly changed since the Congress of the Confederacy provided for the government of the North West Territory in 1787, when, having full sovereign power unlimited by any Constitution, it enacted a system of laws for that Territory and provided for their due and orderly execution; and since the Congress of the United States provided in 1803 for the government of the vast territory ceded to the United States by France, and enacted that the President should take possession of the territory, and "that, until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner, as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion." This Act provided for the administration of the then existing laws, as they had been administered by the officers of France, by officers to be appointed by the President—a mere change from French officers to American officers, and nothing more. The President was to regulate the manner of the exercise of the specified powers to the end of preserving liberty, property and religion; but he could neither increase, diminish nor change the powers themselves. He had no more power over them than the Secretary of the Treasury has over the revenue laws. His was executive power, pure and simple. And even that measure of authority was limited in time to the then session of Congress.

The Philippine Act of March 2d, 1901, provided that "all military, civil and judicial powers necessary to govern the Phil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the tenth day of December, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, and at Washington on the seventh day of November, nineteen hundred, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion." In the Louisiana instance, the military, civil and judicial powers existing at the time of the cession, and none others, were to be administered. In the Philippine instance, all military, civil and judicial powers necessary to govern the islands were to be administered. In the first case, existing laws were to be executed; in the second case, any and all laws thought necessary by the President were to be set up and executed. The contrast between the essential principles and the actual grants of power to the President in the two Acts could not be more complete. In Louisiana, Congress adopted the existing laws and merely changed the personnel of their administrators. In the Philippines, Congress adopted no law at all, but deposited all power in the agents of the President.

The expansions and dominations, now almost encircling the globe, entered upon by Congress have cost the people of the United States a very great expenditure of blood and treasure, and a severe shock to the ideas of liberty, self-government and equality which used to be thought fundamental, and which we professed (sincerely, it is to be hoped) when we declared war against Spain. But the present situation must be taken as it is. The *status quo ante bellum* cannot be restored, and should not be if it could. It is possible, if the wisdom of Congress shall so determine, to protect and guide the people of the "appurtenant" Territories in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and to give the civilized parts of them a substantially independent self-government, and to deal with the uncivilized tribes (including the "Emperor of Sulu" and his wives, subjects and slaves) by treaties, etc., just as we have for a century constitutionally done with the Indian tribes in the States and Territories on this continent.

That patriot, statesman and great jurist, Chancellor Kent,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said upon the subject, in his Commentaries on the Constitution, that:

"Such a state of absolute sovereignty, on the one hand, and of absolute dependence, on the other, is not congenial with the free and independent spirit of our native institutions; and the establishment of distant territorial governments, ruled according to will and pleasure, would have a very natural tendency, as all pro-consular governments have had, to abuse and oppression."

Most of these difficulties and dangers can be avoided if we place our relations with these distant and different peoples on the footing of friendly assistance and protection in self-government, instead of on that of an absolute dominion. Although the present spirit of the times, both in public and private operations, may be that "They should take who have power, and they should keep who can," there is no good ground for discouragement to those who hope for the increase and diffusion of happiness among men. The disorders of policies and ambitions, and the warfare of contending and selfish interests among nations and in the social world, will by and by give way before the ever-increasing intelligence of all peoples.

"The tumult of the times disconsolate
To inarticulate murmurs dies away,
While the eternal ages watch and wait."

While the liberty of speech, of education and of religion exists, the golden future will draw nearer and nearer, however much the present may be clouded.

GEORGE F. EDMUNDS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE DEPENDENCIES.

BY GEORGE S. BOUTWELL, FORMERLY SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY.

THE opinions given by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, were given in the cases known under the general name of Insular Tariff Cases—the case of De Lima & Co. and the case of Samuel B. Downes, both against the collector of the port of New York. In each case, the opinion was given by Mr. Justice Brown, and in each case the decision was reached through a bare majority of the Court. In the case of De Lima, the final question in which the public is concerned was this: Was the Island of Porto Rico, after the treaty with Spain for the transfer of sovereignty had been ratified and exchanged, and the proclamation thereof made at Washington, a part of the territory of the United States and subject to the provision of the Constitution which declares that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The ratification of the treaty was proclaimed at Washington the 11th day of April, 1899, and the articles which were the subject of controversy were imported in the autumn of that year. At that time, Congress had not acted in any manner in regard to the Island of Porto Rico. On the 12th day of April, 1900, an act known as the Foraker Act was passed, which provided a form of political organization for the government of the Island. Five justices, namely, Chief Justice Fuller, Justice Harlan, Justice Brewer, Justice Brown and Justice Peckham, concurred in the opinion that the goods so imported from Porto Rico into New York were entitled to admission free of duty. The decision is in these words:

"We are therefore of opinion that at the time these duties were levied, Porto Rico was not a foreign country, within the meaning of the tariff laws, but a Territory of the United States, that the duties

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were illegally exacted, and that the plaintiffs are entitled to recover them back."

By the words of the decision, Porto Rico was declared to be a Territory of the United States; and from the decision itself it might be inferred that the uniformity clause of the Constitution applied to the Territory. This inference was controlled, however, by the opinion of Justice Brown in the Downes case. Inasmuch as there had been no attempt by Congress to legislate for Porto Rico, the authority of the Constitution in the Island, whatever it was, must have been due entirely to the innate force of the instrument, by which it operated upon a possession of the United States whenever the nature of that possession was such as to command the assent of other nations in conformity to the law of nations. Such must have been the opinion of the four judges who concurred with Justice Brown in the De Lima case. Four justices dissented from the conclusion reached by the majority of the Court. Mr. Justice Gray dissented on the ground that the decision was not reconcilable to the unanimous decision of the Court in the case of Fleming against Page, found in the ninth of Howard, page 603. Justices McKenna, Shiras and White dissented from the opinion of the Court, apparently upon the ground that, at that time, Porto Rico had not been organized as a Territory of the United States under the enabling act that had been passed by Congress.

In the dissenting opinion of the three judges last named, there is a distinct declaration that a duly organized Territory is within the embrace of the Constitution and under the uniformity clause of that instrument.

In the Downes case, Mr. Justice Brown assumed a position and announced a doctrine which is in opposition to the position of his four associates in the De Lima case. The importation which was the subject of controversy in the Downes case, was made after the 12th of April, 1900, when the Foraker Act was passed. By that act, provision was made for a Territorial government in Porto Rico. A legislative body, consisting of two branches, was created, and authority was given for the appointment of a Governor and Attorney-General. Courts were to be created and authority was given to litigants for an appeal from the courts of Porto Rico to the Supreme Court of the United States. By the same act a duty was levied upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

products of Porto Rico that might be brought into the United States. The question was as to the validity of the duty so imposed. In this case, Mr. Justice Brown, for himself alone, as appears from the record, assumed and maintained by argument the position that the Constitution of the United States was framed by the thirteen States, and that its scope and authority were limited to the thirteen States and to such States as from time to time might be added thereto; further than this, that the Constitution did not, by its own force, extend to the possessions of the United States, whether created into Territories with a regular form of government, or whether they were outlying, unorganized possessions. His position is easily understood. It is not without some support from the men who framed the Constitution. Its weakness is in the fact that the political history of the country and the records of the Supreme Court, with singular unanimity, maintain contrary doctrines, so far as this, assuredly —that the Territories, when organized, are, by the fact of organization, brought within the scope of the Constitution. These authorities assume that a Territorial organization constitutes a pledge to the inhabitants of a Territory that, under circumstances which in the nature of things are likely to arise, a Territory is to become a State in the Union. His opinion was not supported by the opinion of any other member of the Court. Three justices who concurred with him in the majority opinion in the Downes case, namely, Justice White, Justice Shiras and Justice McKenna, differed from him in regard to the scope of the Constitution, and maintained, as a doctrine, that, whenever a possession had been organized as a Territory, it became at once and thenceforth a part of the United States and subject to the jurisdiction of the Constitution, without any special declaration by Congress to that effect. Mr. Justice Gray concurred in the majority opinion, but without committing himself to the doctrine set up by Mr. Justice Brown. Four justices, Chief Justice Fuller, Justice Harlan, Justice Brewer and Justice Peckham, were of opinion that the Constitution applies to new possessions of the United States as soon as such possessions are transferred by treaty with the former sovereign, followed by the proclamation of the President that the treaty had been duly ratified.

Hence it follows, that seven of the Justices of the Supreme Court were of opinion that the Constitution became applicable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a Territory whenever such Territory was duly organized, and four of the seven expressed the opinion that the Constitution applied to the possessions whenever acquired agreeably to the law of nations. It follows from these opinions, that the Court as a majority must hold, whenever the question is presented, that the uniformity clause of the Constitution, in regard to the levy of duties, excises and imposts, is applicable, not only to the States, but also to the Territories that may have been duly organized. The official action of the several justices warrants the conclusion that the four justices who concurred with Justice Brown in the opinion in the Downes case, were of the opinion that at the time the importation was made, which was the subject of controversy, the Island of Porto Rico had not been incorporated as a Territory agreeably to the usage of the country. On the other hand, the Chief Justice and the three justices concurring with him were of opinion that Porto Rico was, at the time of importation, a duly organized Territory of the United States, or otherwise that as a dependency the rules of uniformity applied to it. This difference of opinion must at some time disappear; and it may be assumed that, whenever the government that was authorized by the Foraker Act has been duly organized and set in motion, the difference of opinion in the Court, as far as seven justices are concerned, will have disappeared.

Upon this statement of the case the following conclusions may be deduced: As Justice Brown was of the opinion that Porto Rico, at the time of the importation of the articles in controversy in the De Lima case, was not foreign territory but a possession of the United States, and as he was also of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States did not apply to that Island and that Congress had not legislated concerning duties or imposts for the Island, he could only reach the conclusion that the duty which had been levied upon the De Lima importation had no authority either in the Constitution or in the laws of the United States, and therefore that the assessment made by the collector was unlawful. The four justices who concurred with him being of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States did apply to Porto Rico, were consequently of the opinion that the assessment of duties was illegal, inasmuch as under the Constitution the uniformity clause was applicable to trade between Porto Rico and New York. Hence, these five justices, al-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though entertaining different opinions as to the scope of the Constitution, were brought necessarily to the same conclusion upon the question which was at issue in the De Lima case, namely: "That, at the time these duties were levied, Porto Rico was not a foreign country within the meaning of the tariff laws, but a Territory of the United States, and that the duties were illegally exacted."

In the Downes case, Justice Brown expressed the opinion that the Constitution of the United States did not apply to any territory of the United States not included within the limits of a State. This opinion, whether sound or otherwise, is not, in any particular, in conflict with his holding in the De Lima case, but is entirely consistent with it. At the time of the importation which was in controversy in the Downes case, the act known as the Foraker Act had been passed, but the Territorial form of government for which provision had been made in that act had not been organized and put in operation. In that condition of affairs, it was entirely consistent for Justice Brown to hold, that the act imposing a duty of fifteen per cent. of the duties imposed under the Dingley Law was a legal proceeding on the part of the government of the United States, inasmuch as the territory of Porto Rico was no longer foreign territory, and inasmuch as it was not, in his opinion, within the scope of the Constitution. It followed necessarily that Congress could legislate, under its own discretion, for the tariff system of Porto Rico, assuming always, what is not by every one admitted, that Congress has power to legislate beyond the scope of the Constitution, from which its own authority to legislate is derived. Thus it appears that so far as the two cases are dealt with by Justice Brown, his action is consistent with his position that the Constitution of the United States does not extend beyond the States of the Union. His support in the Downes case is derived first from Justice White, Justice Shiras and Justice McKenna. The reasonable conclusion deducible from their concurring opinion is this, namely: the Constitution of the United States applies not only to the States, but also to such Territories as may have been created by act of Congress and duly organized. Following this opinion is the conclusion on their part, that at the time of the importation of the articles in controversy in the Downes case, Porto Rico had not been created a Territory and so organized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as to justify the opinion on their part that the Constitution extended to the Island. In that condition of opinion, they concur in the conclusion reached by Mr. Justice Brown, that the legislation in the Foraker Act, by which a duty was imposed on the products of Porto Rico was legal, inasmuch as the uniformity clause of the Constitution had no application to the Island. Therefore, and for the time being, the Foraker Act was within the scope of the authority of Congress. Of Mr. Justice Gray, it is to be said that his statement justifies the conclusion that, in his opinion, Porto Rico was in a transition period, and that during that period Congress had power to legislate.

Having in mind these opinions, certain views as to the future action of the Court may be deduced, namely: That the three justices who concurred with Justice Brown must reach the conclusion, at some time not far distant, if a case should arise, that Porto Rico is a Territory of the United States and subject to the Constitution of the United States. Justice Gray has not so committed himself but that he may concur with the three justices referred to. In this condition of opinion, it must happen that seven justices, and perhaps eight justices, will unite in the conclusion that the Territories of the United States, as they may from time to time be created by act of Congress and duly organized, are brought within the scope of the Constitution. Porto Rico is already an organized Territory or its organization as a Territory is soon to be completed. It must, therefore, be recognized by the Court, if a question should arise, as within the scope of the Constitution.

Not much time can elapse before a similar condition of things must exist in the Philippine Islands. A military government cannot be maintained for an indefinite period. It follows, therefore, that, very soon, every dependency which has come into the possession of the United States through the treaty with Spain, will be organized in a Territorial government, and, therefore, that, within the same period of time, the Constitution of the United States will be made applicable to each of them, through the expressed opinions of a large majority of the Justices of the Supreme Court. This being the case, the practical conclusion must be that which has been demanded by the Anti-imperialists of the country, namely: that the entire possessions of the United States that have been acquired in conformity to the law of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations, will be under the jurisdiction of the Constitution, and that to them as to the States the clause which requires that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" will be applicable. Thus the demand of the Anti-imperialists will have been satisfied, though only through a process of delay. From the opinions of the different members of the Court, it may be inferred reasonably that they entertain the opinion, that the clause of the Constitution which provides that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," is to be interpreted in its natural signification, and that the Territories of the United States may be disposed of at the will of Congress.

GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORLD'S NATIONAL INDEBTEDNESS.

BY O. P. AUSTIN, CHIEF OF THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

RECENT international complications in the Far East and other parts of the world, the raising of great war loans by our own Government and that of England, and the floating of another loan by the United States for the purpose of interest reduction, seem to justify at this time a study of national debt conditions, past and present.

The national debts of the world, as nearly as can now be ascertained, aggregate $31,800,000,000, if we include the $150,000,000 borrowed by the United Kingdom, $85,000,000 by Russia, and $75,000,000 by Germany during the present year. According to the most trustworthy information available, the world's national debts aggregated $2,500,000,000 in 1793 at the beginning of the Napoleonic wars, and at the actual opening of the nineteenth century were probably about one-tenth of the sum recorded at its close. It is during the latter half of the century, however, that the growth has been greatest and most remarkable. From 1793 to 1848, the increase of the world's indebtedness was only from $2,500,000,000 to $8,500,000,000, while, from 1848 to 1901, the growth was from $8,500,000,000 to $31,800,000,000. Thus, in the fifty-five years from 1793 to 1848, the increase was $6,000,000,000, or at an average rate of $109,000,000 per annum; while, in the fifty-three years from 1848 to 1901, the increase was $23,000,000,000, or at an average rate of $434,000,000 per annum. In other words, the world's national indebtedness has increased during the second half of the nineteenth century at a rate fully four times as great as that which marked the increase during the first half of that period.

The fact that this large increase in national indebtedness has been simultaneous with the world's adoption of steam and steel for land and sea transportation, suggests that railway and steam-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship construction and operation are responsible for at least a part of this indebtedness, and this is, doubtless, the fact. Many of the European nations and most of the British colonies own their railway systems, which they have either acquired by purchase, created by direct action, or encouraged by contributions. Most of the German railways are owned by the State or National Governments. Two-thirds of the railways of Russia are owned by the Government, and this is also true, more or less, of Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Italy; while France, which now owns some of the railways of that country, will, by the middle of the century, become the owner of practically the entire system, partly through direct contributions to their construction, and partly through an agreement by which the companies constructing the railways are to turn them over to the Government at a given date. In the British colonies, the railways were for the most part constructed with the direct aid of the colonial Governments, while in the South American countries the Governments have, in a number of important cases, aided railway construction either by direct action or guarantees. In the United States, as is well known, the only aid given to railways by the National Government has been through land grants and the guarantees of the Pacific Railway bonds, which within the past few years have been so adjusted that the entire amount will be refunded to the Government.

A larger factor, however, in the increase of national indebtedness which has characterized the second half of the period under consideration is the expense incident to wars and the maintenance of armies and navies. This increase is especially marked in the case of the older and stronger Governments, while in the newer countries and the colonies the increase has been chiefly due to the development of transportation routes and other works of public utility. The enormous standing armies of the European countries have, during the past half-century, added greatly to their regular annual expenditures; while the frequently recurring wars, with their ever-increasing cost, have, as in the recent cases above referred to, compelled large and instant additions to national indebtedness. The great cost of modern engines of war, and the enormous outlay entailed by each day of their active use, now compel an enormous increase in the expenditures of a nation whenever it enters upon war. The Crimean war, the wars of France in con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nection with her colonial undertakings, the Civil War in the United States, the war between France and Germany, the Russo-Turkish war, the war between China and Japan, the Spanish-American war, and the British war in South Africa, coupled with numerous less important events of this character, have been largely responsible for the enormous increase of national indebtedness in the closing half of the century. The Austrian debt, which at the middle of the century was $600,000,000, is now $1,700,000,000; that of Germany (exclusive of the State debts) has increased from $115,948,000 in 1870 to $557,000,000 in 1900; that of Italy, from $1,400,000,000 in 1869 to $2,583,000,000 in 1900; that of Russia, from $600,000,000 in 1853 to more than $3,000,000,000 in 1900, and that of France, from a little over a billion dollars in 1852 to $5,800,000,000 in 1900.

The English-speaking nations, the United Kingdom and the United States—omitting the English-speaking colonies for the moment—are the only ones which have shown, during the period under consideration, a disposition to decrease rather than increase their national debts. The British debt in 1857 was over $4,000,000,000 and by 1900 had been reduced to about $3,000,000,000, though the United Kingdom has, since March, 1900, increased her debt by nearly $450,000,000. The debt of the United States reached its highest figure in 1865, when it stood at $2,756,431,571, but by 1900 it had been reduced to $1,107,711,257, the figures in each case representing the "total debt less cash in the Treasury."

Bringing the study down to a shorter period, say from 1870 to 1900, it may be said, in general terms, that the debts of the Latin-American nations have increased during that period fifty per cent.; those of Europe, exclusive of the United Kingdom, one hundred per cent.; those of the Asiatic nations, whose debt statistics are available, two hundred per cent.; those of the British colonies, exclusive of India, from three to four hundred per cent.; while the United Kingdom, meantime, reduced her debt twenty-five per cent., and the United States reduced hers fifty per cent.

The above facts are somewhat suggestive of the debt habits of the various great ethnological groups of people which may be considered in conjunction with the national groups. The author of the latest edition of "Fenn on the Funds" calls attention somewhat pointedly to this characteristic by saying:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is impossible to examine the histories of national debts without being struck by the fact, that the conditions surrounding their creation are not only of great diversity, but in many cases incompatible with one recognizable common principle. There are nations who almost paraphrase a famous saying: 'It is a fine day; let us go out and increase our national debt;' and there are others—though they are few—which abstain from contracting obligations almost to a niggardly degree. . . . Another even more disquieting feature is the spirit of levity in which many nations—chiefly Latin nations—evidently treat their national debts. To all appearances, the present generation in many parts of the world merrily mortgages not only itself but its offspring; and, as is only to be expected, this light-hearted borrowing leads in many cases to collapse, and in many cases national insolvency seems to be as cheerfully accepted as loaning is indulged in."

This suggestion appears to be not altogether without justification, when we consider that the debt of Spain has more than doubled since 1874; that Italy's public debt has doubled since 1870; that the debt of Portugal is larger *per capita* than that of any other European country, and that the debt of France in 1900 was five times as much as in 1852. The group of European nations which may be termed Germanic show little change in their public indebtedness during recent years, though an analysis of their debts at the present time shows that the work of the past quarter-century has been devoted to the construction and acquisition of ownership of railways and other works of this character, and that these properties in many cases are considered as equivalent for, and producing in part at least the annual charges upon, the national indebtedness. In general terms, it may be said that the Germanic nations, while not materially reducing their indebtedness, have made but slight additions thereto in the last quarter-century, and have accumulated in most cases definite revenue-producing assets as an equivalent of the debts; that the Slav group, of which Russia is the distinct representative, with Austria-Hungary midway between that and the Germanic, have largely increased their indebtedness, but accumulated, meantime, railway and other assets as a partial equivalent; that the Latin nations have increased their indebtedness with a rapidity which might almost be characterized as reckless, and with less definite assets as an equivalent than in the case of the other groups mentioned; that in India and the British colonies generally the increase of indebtedness has been for the construction of railways, roads, irrigating canals, harbor improvements, public buildings and other works of this character; and that, in the case of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Kingdom and the United States, the debt increase, which has been chiefly on account of wars, has been met with a steady and persistent disposition to reduce in time of peace the indebtedness necessarily created in time of war.

As to the class of persons holding these enormous obligations incurred by the various nations, it may be said in general terms that those of the United Kingdom, Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium are held almost entirely by their own citizens; while those of Italy, Spain, Portugal and Russia are held in part by their own citizens, the remainder being held chiefly in France and Germany; those of the Latin-American nations chiefly in England; those of China and Japan chiefly in England, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and France, and those of the British colonies chiefly in the United Kingdom.

A study of this kind would not be complete or satisfactory without some consideration of the relative debt-paying capacity of nations in 1900, as compared with the earlier years of the period under consideration. This is even more difficult to determine than the mere measurement of national indebtedness. True, the population at various dates during the century can be determined with a fair degree of accuracy, and the actual currency of the great nations can also be approximately determined; but in the matter of credit instruments, which now so largely take the place of currency, and in the matter of wealth, the measurement of growth or relative growth is extremely difficult. In general terms, it may be said that, while the world's national debts have increased tenfold during the century, the world's population has during that time increased but about one hundred and fifty per cent.; that gold and silver, which form the basis of the money with which debt payments are made, increased but three hundred per cent., although the proportion of those metals which is now turned into coin is much greater than at the beginning of the century. As to wealth and the various instruments of exchange which serve in fact as currency and vastly increase the availability of the stocks of actual money existing, it may be added that, while they cannot be accurately measured, there is reason to believe that they have increased at a ratio not essentially different from that which characterizes the increase of national debts. The United States, United Kingdom, France and Spain made some crude estimates of their national wealth in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

early part of the century, and the total of their wealth in 1800 has been estimated at $20,000,000,000, while Mulhall in 1895 estimated their wealth at $195,000,000,000, indicating that, at the end of the century, it was fully ten times as much as at the beginning of the century; and, if we assume that the development in other parts of the world has been at about the same proportion, it may without impropriety be said that the increase of national wealth during the century has been at about the same ratio as the increase of national indebtedness, while the great use which is now made of instruments of exchange, in international and in internal commerce, justifies the assumption that the actual increase which has taken place in circulating medium has been at fully as great a ratio as that of national indebtedness.

Another curious fact brought to the surface by a study of the methods of nations in regard to their national debts is the fact that, in a majority of cases, the securities issued represent a greater sum of money than that actually received by the nations issuing them. The recent loan issued by the British Government is a marked example of this characteristic of national debt management. Although nobody questions the entire solvency of the British Government and its ability and disposition to meet its national obligations and systematically reduce them, the recent issue was made at five and a half per cent. below par; so that the generation which redeems these securities will be compelled to refund to the holders of the securities practically six per cent. more of actual cash than the present generation received in borrowing, to say nothing of the annual interest payments which will be made meantime. This peculiarity of national borrowing, which is observable in a large proportion of the loans issued by National Governments during the past quarter-century, is especially emphasized by a study of the rates at which the French loans have been made. The author of "Fenn on the Funds" presents, in the latest edition of that valuable work, a table showing the issue price of French securities from 1816 to 1884, from which it is seen that during that entire period only three of the large number of loans issued were at par, and that the great loan of 1870 was issued at 60.6 per cent., those of 1871 and 1872 at 82.5 per cent. and 84.5 per cent., respectively, and the loan of 1881 at 83.2 per cent., thus obligating future generations for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sums from 18 to 66 per cent. in excess of the amounts actually received by the borrowers.

On the other hand, there are certain features of present conditions with regard to national indebtedness which are more encouraging and more hopeful. One of the marked characteristics of the century has been a reduction in interest rates, though this is, perhaps, somewhat exaggerated by the habit above referred to of issuing bonds at less than their par or face value, with the purpose of obtaining apparently lower interest rates. It may be said, however, in general terms, that the nominal rates of interest have fallen probably one-half, perhaps more, during the century. It will be remembered that the United States in 1865 was paying 7.3 per cent. interest on $830,000,000 of its securities, and that in 1900 it issued $300,000,000 at 2 per cent., thus enjoying the distinction of having not only reduced its interest rate enormously, but of having floated its loans at a lower interest rate than any other nation in the world. In doing so, it issued them actually at par; while, in many cases, those of other Governments bearing even a higher rate of interest are issued below par, as is illustrated by the recent British loan sold at 94½ with rates of interest at 2¾ per cent. for a short term, followed by a permanent rate of 2½ per cent. Considering the debts of the world to-day, it may be said that the bulk of them stand at an interest rate of from 2 to 3½ per cent., or probably about one-half that which the great nations were required to pay, under normal conditions, at the beginning of the century; though in case of exigencies, such as those of the United States referred to, the rate was much higher.

The total expenditures of the nations of the world on account of public debts in 1900, as nearly as can be estimated from their "Budget" statements, amounted to about $1,300,000,000, or slightly more than four per cent. upon the total indebtedness; but this included in some cases sums set aside, as sinking funds or otherwise, for the reduction or "amortization" of the debt.

This subject of sinking fund and debt amortization also presents, in many cases, a somewhat unsatisfactory aspect as to the general habit of many of the nations of the world in regard to debt reduction. In too many cases, apparently, there is little effort at a reduction of national indebtedness; and, in certain cases, especially those of France, Italy and Portugal, the debt has grown to such enormous proportions, and the indisposition to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make serious efforts for its reduction or cancellation has become so marked, that it is no longer measured by the actual amount of obligations outstanding, but only by the *"rentes,"* or annual interest requirement. This is especially true with reference to France and Italy, in which countries there has been apparently little effort at reduction of the principal, but a constant and steady increase in the total amount of their national obligations. The chief effort made seems to be in the line of interest reduction, and a number of loans issued during the past few years have been made at lower interest rates with the purpose of taking up and cancelling those issued at higher rates in earlier years.

It should not be inferred from the above statements that nations habitually omit to provide a sinking fund as a part of the act by which new loans are authorized; but the experience of those who have studied the history of national finances is, that

THE WORLD'S NATIONAL INDEBTEDNESS, BY PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES, AT VARIOUS DATES, FROM 1688 TO 1900.
(From latest official sources.)

DATES.	AUSTRIA. Dollars.	BELGIUM. Dollars.	FRANCE. Dollars.	GERMANY.[1] Dollars.	ITALY. Dollars.
1688	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1702	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1714	.....	.....	[2]389,320,000	.....	.....
1727	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1748	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1775	[3]72,997,500	.....	.....	.....	.....
1783	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1800	[4]170,327,500	.....	.....	25,549,125	.....
1820	480,323,500	.....	[5]689,923,705	150,861,500	.....
1850	[11]608,312,500	.....	[12]1,192,292,500	.....	[13]194,660,000
1870	[17]1,464,816,500	[18]133,147,440	2,676,575,000	[19]115,948,000	[18]1,386,952,500
1880	.....	[22]246,994,341	[23]4,065,946,151	.....	[24]2,218,861,209
1890	[27]1,485,282,500	[28]383,723,525	[25]5,031,119,096	[28]233,932,655	[28]2,469,237,110
1900	[30]1,697,255,140	[31]504,460,000	5,300,691,814	557,626,622	2,583,983,780

DATES.	NETHERLANDS. Dollars.	RUSSIA. Dollars.	UNITED KINGDOM. Dollars.	UNITED STATES. Dollars.	WORLD. Dollars.
1688	.....	.....	3,232,636	.....	.....
1702	.....	.....	62,131,700	.....	.....
1714	.....	.....	175,047,876	.....	.....
1727	.....	.....	257,198,404	.....	.....
1748	.....	.....	363,939,740	.....	.....
1775	.....	.....	613,835,883	.....	.....
1783	.....	.....	1,123,515,090	.....	.....
1800	[6]486,650,000	.....	[2]2,616,488,363	82,976,294	[7]2,433,250,000
1820	[9]700,776,000	.....	[10]4,381,975,906	91,015,566	7,299,750,000
1850	[14]498,621,590	[15]608,312,500	[16]4,082,596,603	63,452,774	[11]8,419,045,000
1870	[18]392,434,560	[18]1,459,950,000	3,896,606,550	[20]2,331,169,956	[21]22,410,232,000
1880	[22]390,823,749	[25]2,238,872,257	3,778,858,366	[20]1,919,326,748	[26]26,249,901,000
1890	[28]442,194,523	[28]2,827,684,692	3,361,115,568	[20]890,784,371	.....
1900	466,419,294	3,167,320,000	3,060,926,304	[20]1,107,711,257	31,201,750,000

[1]Prussia prior to 1870; figures for 1889 and 1900 are exclusive of State debt, which in 1900 aggregated $2,015,958,000.
[2]1716; [3]1763; [4]1789; [5]1810; [6]1802; [7]1793; [8]1830; [9]1814; [10]1815; [11]1848; [12]1852; [13]1847 (figures for Sardinia); [14]1851; [15]1853; [16]1857; [17]1868; [18]1869; [19]chiefly former debt of North German Confederation; [20]total debt less cash in the Treasury; [21]1872; [22]1879; [23]1883; [24]1885; [25]1876; [26]1882; [27]1888; [28]1889; [29]1894; [30]1898; [31]1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in most cases the provision for sinking fund is neglected or the fund created for this purpose is used in emergencies for other purposes. Probably more than half of the securities authorized by the various Governments are accompanied by a requirement that from one-half of one per cent. to one per cent. of the capital of the debt shall be annually set aside by the authorities for the purpose of reducing the indebtedness, this sum to be applied to the purchase of bonds, which are, in most cases, not to be immediately cancelled, but held as a part of the sinking funds and their interest earnings also applied to the increase of the sinking fund. Where this plan is rigidly followed, the result is a steady and permanent debt reduction; but frequently it is ignored, and in some cases, especially in France and Italy, a part of the debt is now designated as "permanent," no date being named for the payment of the bonds and no provision made for anything except the annual interest thereon.

TOTAL INDEBTEDNESS, INTEREST AND OTHER ANNUAL CHARGES, AND PER CAPITA DEBT AND INTEREST OF THE PRINCIPAL NATIONS IN 1900, OR NEAREST PRECEDING DATE.

Countries.	Debt. Dollars.	Interest and other annual charges. Dollars.	Per Capita—Debt. Dollars.	Per Capita—Interest. Dollars.
France	5,800,691,814	241,762,029	150.61	6.28
Russia	3,167,320,000	141,519,000	24.56	1.10
United Kingdom	3,060,926,304	112,985,531	74.83	2.76
Italy	2,583,983,780	114,177,185	81.11	3.58
Spain	1,727,994,620	80,782,000	95.53	4.46
Australasia	1,188,055,000	45,458,000	263.90	10.14
Austria-Hungary	1,154,791,000	51,175,285	25.80	1.14
United States	1,107,711,257	33,545,130	14.52	.44
India	1,031,603,705	33,971,400	4.67	.15
Hungary	904,941,000	41,892,000	47.75	2.22
Turkey	726,511,195	28,419,600	29.25	1.14
Portugal	670,221,374	21,550,320	143.82	4.62
Austria	642,194,000	30,969,000	24.89	1.20
[1]German Empire	557,626,622	18,283,441	9.96	.33
Argentina	509,604,444	26,902,377	128.85	6.80
Belgium	504,459,540	19,536,811	75.63	2.93
Egypt	500,402,729	20,063,637	53.61	2.15
Brazil	480,985,000	21,500,000	33.56	1.50
Netherlands	466,419,294	14,117,838	90.74	2.74
China	287,123,500	12,000,000	.72	.03
Roumania	280,136,991	17,904,996	47.37	3.00
[2]British Colonies	265,541,000	10,500,000	26.43	1.04
Canada	265,494,000	13,392,000	50.59	2.55
Japan	206,799,994	18,126,702	4.73	.41
Mexico	168,771,428	10,699,689	13.36	.84
Greece	168,548,444	6,293,730	69.25	2.58
Uruguay	124,374,189	6,056,000	148.06	7.20
Chile	113,240,000	965,455	36.41	.31
Honduras	89,376,920	1,125,190	219.60	2.76
Sweden	85,154,320	3,173,388	16.71	.62
Denmark	55,795,724	1,891,812	24.15	.82
Other countries	2,309,960,086	14,131,958		
Total	31,201,749,274	1,214,871,504		

[1]In addition to the Imperial debt the individual German States have a total indebtedness of $2,015,958,000, chiefly incurred for works of public utility.
[2]Except Australasia, Canada and India.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The table printed at the foot of page 168 shows the debts of the principal nations at various periods since 1688. The table on page 169 presents the latest figures, available when this article was originally written, of the total national indebtedness of each of the principal nations of the world, the interest and other annual charges thereon, and the *per capita* of debt and annual interest charge.

Supplementing this table by figures since received, we find that France has the largest debt, the total being $5,808,650,000; that the United Kingdom is second, the total being $3,494,000,000; Russia third, $3,253,000,000; Italy fourth, $2,583,983,780. The German States are included in the list because of the fact that their obligations were largely created for railway and other works of public utility, and have been constantly included in the earlier statements of European national obligations, and to omit them would impair the value of the figures for comparative purposes. In the matter of *per capita* debt, the Australian colonies carry the heaviest burden, their *per capita* debt being $263.90 and their annual interest and amortization charge $10.14 *per capita,* which is also the highest *per capita* of interest charge recorded in the entire list of Governments. The fact, however, that they have valuable and profitable assets, such as railways and other public works, as an equivalent, makes the burden more apparent than real. It is gratifying, on the other hand, to note that the interest charge against the debt of the United States is but 44 cents *per capita,* as compared with very much higher figures for most of the other Governments, which are generally considered the most prosperous and well-managed as to their finances, the interest upon the debt of the Netherlands in 1900 amounting to $2.74 for each individual; that of Belgium, $2.93; that of the United Kingdom $2.76, and that of France, $6.28.

O. P. AUSTIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. FISKE AND THE HISTORY OF NEW YORK.

BY MRS. SCHUYLER VAN RENSSELAER.

MR. JOHN FISKE'S recently published book on the Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America is framed on the same lines as his Beginnings of New England and his Old Virginia and Her Neighbors. It is not specifically the story of one town, and it ends with the year 1735. Yet Mr. Fiske devotes three-fourths of his 650 pages to the colonies founded by the Dutch; any account of them must be chiefly the story of their capital, and one that comes down to 1735 covers the periods that have been most generally misunderstood.

In former numbers of this REVIEW I tried to show why the early story of the town that was destined to be the capital of the "pivot province" and the Empire State has been misconceived and miswritten. Ignorance in regard to it has, of course, worked against the right understanding of the broad story of American colonial development. It has blotted out the memory or distorted the significance of many interesting events, and has too narrowly concentrated upon the colonies planted by the English our gratitude for the building of the Republic. Nothing else in the domain of American history is so much needed to-day as a true and reasonably full account of the youthful years of the city on Manhattan. This is what we hoped that Mr. Fiske would write. He has never been one of those thorough investigators of fundamental data and ideas whose conclusions are accepted by historical scholars, even when unfamiliar and unwelcome. But the great popular vogue of his books has been based upon a belief that facts so well presented, with such clarity of statement and such attractiveness of style, must have been well considered. He has shown less narrowness of vision in dealing with New England than some of her other sons. And the knowledge that his new book was to form part of a comprehensive history of the ante-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cedents and the formation of the Republic, supported the belief that it would be sympathetically approached and carefully prepared. But these expectations have been disappointed.

Our lack of competent historians could for generations be excused by the inaccessibility of our early records. In recent years we have well atoned for our forefathers' indifference in this respect. We have now a great store of excellent raw materials from which the historian may gather accurate information, and of admirable monographs helpful at every stage of his work. Even if he wishes to write briefly, however, and for a popular audience, he must sift and arrange these materials for himself. Even if he desires to paint no more than the chief scenes and figures of the long and varied panorama in their true outlines, in just perspective, and with proper lights and shadows, nevertheless he must select his own point of view, draw his own design, and mix his own colors. Moreover, industry, conscientious accuracy, and a friendly open-mindedness are peculiarly needful to make plain a tale which has been told in such a fashion that those who figure in it have been greatly underestimated.

Evidently, Mr. Fiske did not recognize these truths. Evidently, he did not study those sources of knowledge which have not yet been incorporated into easily accessible books; and on scores of pages he shows that he was very careless even in the use of the narratives and documents that he did consult. His mistakes in matters of fact are frequent and sometimes very grave. Some of them are simple repetitions of current errors. Others are resurrections of errors long ago buried under a convincing weight of evidence. And others again are novelties.

Moreover, although Mr. Fiske's formally pronounced estimate of the significance of the tale he has to tell is more justly sympathetic than that of many writers on American history, it is but slenderly supported by the specific judgments and passing comments that one finds in the course of his narrative. Here are the concluding words of his book:

"In the cosmopolitanism which showed itself so early in New Amsterdam and has ever since been fully maintained, there was added to American national life the variety, the flexibility, the generous breadth of view, the spirit of compromise and conciliation needful to save the nation from rigid provincialism. Among the circumstances which prepared the way for a rich and varied American nation, the preliminary settlement of the geographical centre by Dutchmen was certainly one of the most fortunate."

These are intelligent words, and the story of New York, if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intelligently told, would amply prove them such; but Mr. Fiske's readers may not unnaturally wonder a little why he wrote them. Before I say more, however, about his lack of sympathy for his theme, it will be well to show, by a few examples out of many that might be given, how incorrectly he has recorded the facts.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in his book is the one called Verrazano and Hudson. But what may seem its most interesting portion must be taken with a good pinch of salt. Although Mr. Fiske confesses that the question does not admit of "dogmatic assurance," he is strongly tempted to believe that the "River of Norumbega" of the old geographers should be identified with the Hudson rather than the Penobscot, and that in 1540 there was a village of French fur-traders in Manhattan, probably, he thinks, on an island in the sheet of water that was afterwards so well known as the Collect Pond. For the reasons why these things should not be believed, his readers may turn to the chapter on Norumbega in Winsor's Narrative and Critical History of America. But a more definite word must here be said about the more important question whether or no an Englishman named Argall visited Manhattan in its earliest Dutch years.

If it were true that before New Amsterdam was founded Captain Argall and his companions warned the director of the Dutch fur-traders that they had a commission to expel him and "all alien intruders upon His Majesty's territories," and if it were true that by a letter forthwith sent to Virginia the director "submitted himself, company, and plantation to His Majesty and to the governor and government of Virginia," our judgment of the whole later history of New Netherland would be affected, for at every step it must concern itself with the question whether the Dutch or the English had a better right to New Netherland's soil. The words I have quoted, however, occur in a Description of the Province of New Albion, which professed to be the work of one Beauchamp Plantagenet of Belvil in New Albion, but, printed in 1648, was probably written by Plowden when the question of English rights to New Netherland had become a burning one, and he had found that his New Albion patent covered lands long possessed by the Dutch. Heylin and other early compilers paraphrased the so-called Plantagenet's tale, but it has no outside support. Fifty years ago Brodhead wrote that it seemed to him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fabulous, and its true—or, rather, its untrue—character has since been clearly and repeatedly demonstrated; for example, in a long note by Murphy, appended to De Vries's Voyages in the Collections of the New York Historical Society for the year 1857, and in the Winsor History. For many years no scholar or careful student has believed the story of Argall's visit. Yet Mr. Fiske repeats it without a question-mark, and, indeed, elaborates it, saying that Argall "scolded" the Dutch director and made him "haul down the Dutch flag and raise that of England."

The story of a similar visit paid to Manhattan in 1620 by another Englishman, Thomas Dermer, has more foundation. But Mr. Fiske's version of it rests only on second-hand or third-hand testimony; even this does not say that Dermer's interview with certain Hollanders took place on Manhattan itself; and neither there nor anywhere else in America could what Mr. Fiske calls "a multitude" of Dutch traders have been found in the year 1620.

In speaking of the patroonships to which the West Indian Company (the proprietors of New Netherland) granted almost feudal privileges, Mr. Fiske says that after the English conquest in 1664 "the patroons were confirmed in their estates, henceforth called manors." In fact, only one of the old patroonships had survived until this time—Rensselaerswyck, far up the Hudson River. The others had died a natural death or had been bought back by the West India Company. The survival of one, large and flourishing, undoubtedly prompted the erection of the manors that grew conspicuous in the eighteenth century. But the charters of these were framed after English patterns, and for the most part were not issued before the closing years of the seventeenth century.

In more than one semi-burlesque passage Mr. Fiske has taken Irving's Knickerbocker History as his guide. What should be said about the unfortunate influence of this book I tried to say in a former article. It is more than a pity—it is a misfortune—that Mr. Fiske should add himself to the long list of those who have incorporated its jests in professedly serious narratives. So interesting a writer does not need to enliven his pages with other people's caricatures; and, besides, the true story of the times of Van Twiller and Kieft is more picturesque than any travesty could be.

But Knickerbocker cannot be held responsible for Mr. Fiske's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statement that Domine Bogardus, who arrived with Governor Van Twiller in 1633, was New Amsterdam's first clergyman. Such appeared to be the case (for the official records of this period are scanty) until about fifty years ago, when Henry C. Murphy discovered in Holland a letter written from Manhattan in 1628 by one Domine Michaelius to a clerical friend at home. This letter is now one of the chief manuscript treasures of the Lenox Library, and translations of it have often been published—for example, in Miss Booth's History of New York, issued as long ago as 1859, and with annotations by Murphy in the Collections of the Historical Society for 1880. The fact that it identifies the first clergyman of New Amsterdam is the least of its claims to attention. It is a long letter and gives the only extant account, written by an eye witness, of the condition of the Dutch settlement in its earliest days. The original was bought by the Lenox Library in 1894. For half a century every one even superficially interested in the history of New York has known its value, and every writer has profited by it excepting Mr. Fiske.

In telling the often mistold story of Dutch and English rivalry on the banks of the Connecticut Mr. Fiske does not refer to the fact, now universally acknowledged, that the Say-and-Sele patent was a nullity, giving its holders no legal rights. He tells us that after English settlements had almost swamped the earlier Dutch fort on the site of Hartford, "the Dutch remained for some years unmolested there." They were not at once expelled, but molested they were at all times. Nor is it true that in America the Dutch and English people were "quite friendly inclined to one another," that their "antagonism and rivalry" sprang simply from "geographical necessity," and that their only available resource was a "game of bluff." Such a game the Dutch governors may seem to us to have played, but in their own eyes it was the best kind of earnestness that they could compass; and there was no bluff at all in the words and deeds of the New Englanders—there was a very practical aggressiveness, a steady determination to claim whatever lands they wanted, based on a consciousness of their superior strength and sharpened by a confessed dislike for those whom, partly on account of their liberality in matters of religion, they chose to call their "noxious neighbors." To read, for instance, how Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts wrote of the New Netherlanders in his famous diary, or how his son behaved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toward them when governor of Connecticut, is not to find that either was "friendly inclined" in their direction; and a very much stronger word than Mr. Fiske's "bickerings" ought to be applied to the troubles between the two peoples as they continued into Peter Stuyvesant's times.

In describing the terrible Indian war provoked by Governor Kieft, Mr. Fiske shows that he acted in despite of the prayers and warnings of certain conspicuous citizens, but does not make it plain that as a whole the people of Manhattan were blameless in the matter. Yet nothing in colonial literature is more impressive or more pathetic than the protests and explanations which they sent to Holland, and in which they deplore the sin and the shame as well as the material distress that their Governor's wicked rashness had brought upon them. Nor does Mr. Fiske clearly show how near these wars came to wiping out New Amsterdam, which had some 2,500 inhabitants when they began, but less than 1,000 when they ended, and, in spite of its prosperity during the latter part of Stuyvesant's term of rule, never recouped its losses until after the English arrived in 1664. Again, when Mr. Fiske speaks of Kieft's attempt to tax his people unjustly, he misses the really interesting point of the tale. In 1643 the Board of Eight Men—representatives of the people whose appointment Kieft had been forced by the perils of the war to sanction—had unwillingly agreed, provisionally and because of the dire distress of the moment, to the imposition of a direct tax on wine and beer; and this the people had paid. But when a heavy excise tax was again laid by the Governor's sole decree, the refusal to pay was not based simply on poverty or on the ground that the West India Company's right of taxation had not been delegated to their executive. The people objected to a direct tax as such when laid without their own consent, and the brewers and tapsters declared that if they paid it they would "offend the Eight Men and the whole Commonalty." This was New Amsterdam's first protest against "taxation without representation"; it was spoken when the first provocation was given, and it accurately foreshadowed the spirit of New York in Stamp Act days.

When Mr. Fiske approaches Peter Stuyvesant's times he lacks the courage to paint the governor's familiar figure in the veracious colors that would make it seem unfamiliar. Nothing in the singular story of the history-writing of New York is more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

curious than the way in which Stuyvesant's memory has been guarded from the light of truth. It is the one and only point where we have shown that "filio-pietistic" spirit which, for generations, New England writers displayed toward the whole of their story. We have forgotten that "Father Stuyvesant" more than once narrowly escaped deposition by the home authorities and, as long as he bore rule in New Netherland, was generally, bitterly, and deservedly hated there. We forget that he was not called Father Stuyvesant then, but names of quite another kind—like "our old Muscovy wolf." We remember him with indulgent affection partly because his words and deeds dropped out of mind, but the long survival of his farm, his house, his church, and his pear-tree kept his figure definite when all other New Amsterdamers were fading into shadowy silhouettes, partly because Knickerbocker painted no other with any worthy qualities, and partly because of the mere picturesqueness of his violent temper and his wooden leg.

In speaking of Stuyvesant Mr. Fiske does just as many others have done. He is forced to cite words and deeds that reveal an unpleasing figure, and then he sums up its characteristics in very laudatory words. A "noble, honest, headstrong, opinionated, generous, kindly, conscientious, eager, lion-hearted old soldier," he writes, using adjectives almost identical with Knickerbocker's as quoted on another page. But there is no authority for the "generous," the "kindly," or the "noble"—not even in the tale that Mr. Fiske himself recites. It was not noble, generous, or kindly to declare that resistance to authority is always deeply criminal, no matter what the provocation may be, or so to manage the trial of adversaries that "with shameless disregard of evidence a prearranged verdict of guilty was rendered," or to instigate religious persecutions that "redound to the discredit, not of New Netherland, but of Stuyvesant." The words I cite are Mr. Fiske's; and if he had loyally interpreted the traits that he thus indicates he would not have spoken at all of nobleness or kindliness, and would have shown Stuyvesant's conscientiousness as that of a narrow-minded, conceited, ill-tempered, meddlesome, and not always straightforward tyrant, who was honest, indeed, in money matters, faithful to the material interests of his employers, and anxious for the welfare of his province, but who despised his provincials, wished them to prosper in such ways only as he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saw fit, and bitterly resented any sign of individual or corporate independence as treason to the Company and a personal insult to himself. To say that such a ruler as the voluminous papers of the time show Stuyvesant to have been was "none the less lovable and admirable because he stood for principles of government that have become discredited," is to speak in a way of which Mr. Fiske would hardly approve were the subject some "conscientious" exponent of the ideas of Philip II., James II., or George III. Moreover, it implies that the principles of government for which Stuyvesant stood were not discredited in his own days; and they were, of course, in his European fatherland and among his own New Netherlanders as well as in neighboring colonies. The Dutch Government interfered more than once to loosen the West India Company's despotic grasp upon its province; yet Stuyvesant's ideas were so much more despotic than the Company's that he disobeyed it with regard to the municipal privileges it was forced to grant to New Amsterdam, and was severely censured by it for his intolerance in matters of religion.

It is a great pity that Mr. Fiske did not throw Stuyvesant's character into true relief by contrasting it with that of Adrian Van der Donck, who was the true Father of New Amsterdam, but whose very name has been almost forgotten. Injustice is done to Van der Donck by the statement that he "is notoriously untrustworthy for matters outside of his own personal knowledge; he no more thinks of sifting his statements than any other old gossip." Of course, no one in that age sifted his statements as modern authors are supposed to do. But Van der Donck's writings are for their time exceptionally sober and restrained. They are much less like those of an old gossip than, for example, the more famous writings of John Josselyn, which tell us of New England barley that degenerated into oats and of frogs that sat on their haunches a foot in height. Nor do we find in them any sign of that appetite for the pathologically and diabolically marvellous which Governor Winthrop showed in more passages than the revolting ones about the deformed infant of the schismatic Anne Hutchinson.*

*One of the most interesting passages in Van der Donck's Description of New Netherland is probably the first plea for forest preservation that was framed in America. He says, writing about the year 1655: "There actually is such an abundance of wood in the New Netherlands that, with ordinary care, it will never be scarce there. There always are, however, in every country some people so improvident that even they may come short here; and for this reason we judge that it should not be destroyed needlessly." These are not the words of a man who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To say that the purposes of Stuyvesant in opposing and of Van der Donck in furthering the people's desire for some degree of self-government were "equally honorable," and that the struggle was "simply one theory of government contending against another," is, again, to confuse the mind of readers whom Mr. Fiske himself, in other books, has helped to inspire with the belief that such struggles have a right and a wrong side, and that our estimate of men should be affected by the question whether they fought for or against the progress of humanity. Moreover, such a summing-up detracts from the significance of Van der Donck's figure as representing his fellow-colonists.

But Mr. Fiske's lack of genuine interest in the facts and the meaning of this chapter in our annals is clearly shown by his careless mention of certain papers, protesting against the misgovernment of the West India Company, that were sent to the States-General of Holland in 1649 by the hands of Van der Donck and two colleagues.

Stuyvesant had unwillingly permitted a Board of Nine Men to be elected by the people, to aid him in his judicial duties, and to give him advice which he could accept or not as he chose. Mr. Fiske says that these Nine Men "prepared a memorial to the States-General," that "attached to this memorial was an eloquent *Vertoogh* or Remonstrance"; that in the course of the memorial "the Nine Men invite the attention of the States-General to the golden example set by their neighbors of New England" in political matters; and that "such is the kind of government they wish to imitate in New Netherland."

No paper called a memorial was prepared at this time; and none with any title was sent by the Nine Men in their own name excepting a brief letter introducing Van der Donck and his companions as the people's spokesmen. The documents in question were a Petition from the Commonalty of New Netherland, Additional Observations on the Preceding Petition, and a long explanatory dissertation called the Remonstrance of New Netherland and the Occurrences There by the People of New Netherland. All of these were signed, explicitly on behalf of the people, by eleven citizens, actual or former members of the Board of Nine Men. In

wrote in the spirit of an old gossip; and I commend to the attention of Mr. Fiske's readers Van der Donck's essay on the beaver (included in his Description), which, I think, is as good an example of scientific writing, in the seventeenth century sense of the term, as could easily be found.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none of them is the golden political example of New England mentioned. And, although such mention does occur in certain footnotes attached to the Additional Observations, it has not the meaning that Mr. Fiske reads into it. The nature of the New England governments is explained to show that colonies flourish better under free than under despotic institutions, and that the former may be well adapted to American conditions. But what the people ask for, in the Petition and in the Additional Observations, is very distinctly stated: "Suitable burgher *(borgerlycke)* government, such as your High Mightinesses shall consider adapted to the province, and somewhat resembling the laudable government of our Fatherland."

In making this radical mistake Mr. Fiske follows in the steps of Bancroft who, writing before the records of our early days were published, believed that New Netherland got its desire for self-government from the example set by New England and through the direct influence of the many New Englanders who had settled within its own borders. But this influx had barely begun when, in the time of Governor Kieft, New Amsterdam first demanded political rights. Then, and at every later step in the story, we read the same request—never for a copy or a paraphrase of New England's arrangements, but always for "suitable burgher government" of the pattern long known in Holland. And in this shape municipal liberties were finally granted to New Amsterdam and to neighboring towns.

"In a spirit of mistaken caution," Mr. Fiske writes again, "the West India Company had instructed the Director to give the public offices to none but Dutchmen." What the Company really said on this point, at the time when municipal freedom was granted, was that in filling offices, "Every attention must be paid to honest and respectable individuals, who, we hope, can be found among the burghers; and especially do we wish that those promoted thereto be as much as possible persons of this nation who, we suppose, will give the most satisfaction to the burghers and inhabitants."

Again, Mr. Fiske tells us that Stuyvesant "retained in his own hands" the appointment of these officials, although the West India Company had ordered that they should be elected. This is true; but it should also have been said that, a few years later, the people forced Stuyvesant to surrender the usurped rights.

These are only some of the most important points where Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fiske goes astray in his account of the Dutch period in New York; and he errs again in representing the people as so well content with the rule of Nicolls, their first English Governor, that "the four years of his governorship were long remembered as a kind of golden age in the history of the colony." Twice, at least, Nicolls's colonials bitterly resented his acts as infringements of definite promises—when he summoned only the people of Long Island and Westchester to consider his new code, called the Duke's Laws, and when he blotted out the municipal rights of New Amsterdam. Also, they objected to the establishment of trial by jury, which Mr. Fiske refers to as a benefit, preferring their own simpler ways of securing justice. And the eager welcome they gave to the Dutch squadron which recaptured New York in 1673 certainly does not indicate that they had "felt that their rights were better protected" during Nicolls's administration "than ever before."

But the most disappointing chapter in Mr. Fiske's book is, perhaps, the one called the Downfall of the Stuarts. It includes the story of Jacob Leisler, and with this, at least, Mr. Fiske should have taken pains, for in an earlier book he had referred to it as more full of human interest than any other of pre-Revolutionary times, excepting only the story of Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia. Materials for its right presentation abound, but are difficult to deal with on account of their confused and violently partisan character. Mr. Fiske seems to have shirked the task of examining and collating them; yet it was an imperative one, for their contents have never been set forth in detail, and seldom with fairness.

Mr. Fiske says, very sensibly, that "concerning Leisler's integrity of purpose there can be little doubt." He understands that in the spring of 1689—in the unsettled time when the crown of England was passing from the Catholic James to his Protestant daughter and her husband, and when the imprisonment of Sir Edmund Andros in Boston left New York in charge of a weak and distrusted Lieutenant-Governor—Leisler and his friends thought the province in imminent danger, and had some good reasons for their belief. He also understands that when this German merchant took control of the affairs of the province he felt that he was loyally serving the new sovereigns. He does not regard him as a vulgar usurper or a mere demagogue. But he does paint him as a very rash and stupid person who could not grasp the real facts of the situation, "a crank with his brain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dominated by a narrow group of morbid, fixed ideas," who, toward the end of his career, showed such "almost incredible fatuity" that our verdict must be "evidently the poor man's mind was dazed." The records of the time, if read in their entirety, reveal a very different figure. They show that, although Leisler had faults and fell into mistakes, his chief blunder was in underestimating the interest that William's government took in its province of New York, and the willingness of its appointees to deal fairly by all New Yorkers. They show that from beginning to end his course was consistent and logical, that he was in many ways more intelligent than most of his contemporaries, and that even toward the last he was not at all "dazed," but clearly understood that to hold any other attitude than the one he did hold would be to confess that all his acts for a space of more than two years had been unlawful. The impression given by any real study of the contemporary documents, although many of them are virulently anti-Leislerian, is that if this plain, untrained and passionate, but conscientious, patriotic, energetic, and in some ways broad-visioned German merchant had been the governor of a province under better conditions, he might have been one of the very best that our colonial times anywhere produced.

Mr. Fiske does not clearly show how large a part the people of New York played in putting Leisler into power; or how distinctly he based his right to power upon their support; or how hard he tried to respect the forms of law while forced into many arbitrary acts by the exigencies of his difficult task; or how this task was complicated and his arbitrariness was provoked by the opposition, very active and very selfish and unscrupulous, of that "aristocratic" party whose leaders had been officeholders under King James; or how frequently and insistently he wrote to England explaining all his acts, asking that they might be sanctioned, and begging that orders for the government of the province might be sent; or how long these orders were delayed; or how surely the province would have been given over to anarchy, distress, and danger if meanwhile Leisler had laid down his power.

Mr. Fiske tells us that Leisler was a German, married to a Dutch wife, and also that his letters are "those of a man with too little education to shape his sentences correctly"; but he does not add that these letters were written in English. He speaks of Leisler's fear and hatred of Papists, but does not explain that he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naturally imbibed these feelings, being the son of a clergyman who, when driven out of the Palatinate by the French wars, ministered to other refugees from Catholic persecution at Frankfort-on-the-Main. Then, "vague democratic ideas and hopes still hazier were in the air," is not a good description of the attitude of the people in a place where the democratic spirit had always prevailed, and where rights of assembly had long been desired, had recently been granted for a brief time, and then had been taken away. The New Yorkers of 1689 knew quite as well what they hoped for from William and Mary as what they dreaded at the hands of the French King and his Canadian subjects, and also at the hands of James II. should the French King restore him to the throne. This would have been made clearer if Mr. Fiske had even explained that, when King James cancelled the Charter of Liberties which he had permitted to take effect while he was still the Duke of York, it was chiefly because, as his advisers pointed out, this document (drawn up by the New Yorkers in their first provincial assembly) named "the people" as entitled to political rights, while so definite a term had not been used in any other colonial charter or patent.

Mr. Fiske dwells upon the signs of popular discontent with Leisler's government that gradually displayed themselves, but, mentioning none of an opposite kind, leaves us to wonder how Leisler retained his power, for he had no soldiers excepting volunteers who could have deserted him at any moment.

The most important incident in Leisler's story Mr. Fiske mentions only in a foot-note. This was the arrival, in December, 1689, of the first orders that William's government had sent to New York. Mr. Fiske says that the letter containing them "was not addressed to Nicholson by name, but to 'Our Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of our Province of New York in America.'" The superscription may be found in Brodhead as well as in our Colonial Documents. It reads:

> "To our Trusty and wellbelovd Francis Nicholson Esqre our Lieut Governor and Commander in Chief of our Province in New York in America, and in his absence to such as for the time being take care for Preserving the Peace and administring the Lawes in our said Province of New York in America."

Nicholson was absent when the letter arrived; he had abandoned his post and returned to England, arriving there before the letter was sent, although not before it had been prepared. Only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three of the councillors appointed by King James had been in New York when he left; and his dilatoriness and theirs in recognizing the change of dynasty had been the prime cause why the people refused to recognize the authority he deputed to them, and put Leisler at the head of affairs. Therefore, although it may have been questionable logic, it was certainly not, as Mr. Fiske asserts, "crank logic" that led Leisler to claim the king's letter and to consider himself charged with the responsibilities conferred by its words, which declared:

> "We do hereby authorize and Impower you to take upon you the Government of the said Province, calling to your assistance in the administration thereof the Principal Freeholders and Inhabitants of the same or so many of them as you shall think fitt."

Moreover, the superscription on this letter closely resembled that on the orders previously sent to Massachusetts, and these had temporarily confirmed in their power the magistrates whom the people had installed when, with much more violence than the Leislerians used, they had thrown Governor Andros and his colleagues into jail. Leisler based all his subsequent words and deeds upon his belief that he had a right to receive this letter and to act upon its instructions, conjointly with his belief that the people had had a right to make him the guardian of their interest in a time of utter uncertainty, confusion, and peril. In reports sent to England he carefully explained how and why he had claimed the letter, not concealing the fact that two of the councillors of the deposed king had "pretended thereunto."

And when, in 1698, the parliament of England rehabilitated his memory, cancelling the judgments of the court in New York, it sustained his course, saying that he had been "confirmed" in the power that the people had bestowed upon him by His Majesty's letter of July 30th, 1689.

Excepting the vague and provisional instructions contained in this letter no orders whatever came from England between the breaking out of the troubles in the spring of 1689 and the beginning of the year 1691. Even when, in December, 1690, a new Governor, Henry Sloughter, set sail for New York, his advent had not been announced to the people he was to rule, although his commission had been issued more than a year before. His ship was driven by stress of weather to Bermuda, and one of his subordinates, Major Ingoldsby, reached Manhattan some weeks in advance of him. Mr. Fiske says that Leisler would not yield

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fort to Ingoldsby without a written order from the king or the governor, and "unfortunately Ingoldsby had no official documents with him." Ingoldsby could have had no documents entitling him to demand possession of the fort. His major's commission simply gave him command of a portion of the troops that had been sent out, and ordered him to submit himself to the ruler of the province. It did not authorize him under any conditions to represent the governor or to exercise his powers; these rights had been conferred on the governor's council. Both he and Leisler knew, of course, that to surrender the fort would be to hand over the civil power as well. Leisler understood that to make such a transfer, excepting to a properly accredited official, would mean a confession that from the first he had had no right to his power. And he also saw that it would involve him in great danger, for the local enemies who, from the first, had traduced as well as opposed him, had instantly gained Ingoldsby's ear.

Mr. Fiske's account of the events next in order is practically the same that has often been written before, but never by any one who had carefully examined the contemporary documents. These show that Leisler offered Ingoldsby and his soldiers courteous entertainment outside the fort; that the disorders that broke out before the governor arrived were much more the fault of Ingoldsby and the local "aristocrats" than of Leisler, and that the first of the shots exchanged between the fort and the king's troops were probably fired by the latter. Nor is "almost incredible fatuity" the term to apply to Leisler's conduct in not yielding up the fort as soon as Sloughter's arrival was announced to him. His course at this moment was still the logical outcome of the attitude he had held for almost two years, and it was still based upon the belief that William must have meant to sanction his course as that of a loyal and a lawfully appointed temporary guardian of the king's own interests. His next step is also incorrectly reported. He soon saw that he could expect no recognition whatever from Sloughter, and on the morning following the latter's arrival sent him a letter. Mr. Fiske says it was "a conciliatory letter—disclaiming any wish to withhold the fort from him, but asking further explanation on certain points." As any reader may see, for it is printed in the appendix to Mr. Fiske's book, it is really a letter of surrender, and it asks for no explanations but simply prays that the writer may be treated in the way

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

due to a person ready to give "an exact account of all his actions and conduct."

Mr. Fiske relates that at the trial of Leisler, of his chief supporter, Jacob Milborne, and of several of their adherents, the prisoners "were charged with treason and murder for refusing to surrender the fort upon Ingoldsby's arrival, and for firing upon his troops and thereby causing wanton and wicked destruction of life." In fact, the indictment confused dates in a seriously unjust way, making the case against the prisoners much stronger. It charged that the fort had been "forcibly held," not against Ingoldsby, but against Sloughter himself, and that shots had been fired from it after instead of before his arrival—an assertion made in no other contemporary document.

Seeing how Mr. Fiske has misunderstood the whole antecedent story, we are not surprised to find that he says, in regard to the tragic conclusion of the trial, that the execution of Leisler and Milborne "was, of course, entirely legal," although "it was afterward generally admitted" to have been "a great mistake." But a different judgment in regard to the legality of the execution has been passed by other modern writers; and at all events, Mr. Fiske should have shown that justice had been grievously outraged by the character of the trial, and was outraged again when Sloughter decided to hang Leisler and Milborne after permitting them to appeal to the King.

Sloughter had been distinctly charged to "examine strictly and impartially" into the state of affairs in New York and to render "a true and faithful account thereof." Instead, he refused to hear any explanations from Leisler or his friends, but opened his ears to their bitter enemies and assigned to these important parts in the legal proceedings—even the preliminary examination of the prisoners with a view to their commitment for trial. Again, it is an interesting point, which Mr. Fiske does not mention, that while some of their comrades were tried and condemned upon evidence, Leisler and Milborne denied the competency of the court, refused to plead, and were condemned as "mutes." And when Mr. Fiske writes that Leisler behaved on the scaffold with "Christian dignity," but Milborne "spoke in a tone of vindictive anger," his words should again be tested by reference to one of the documents he has placed in his appendix. This shows that in general Milborne spoke as piously and forgivingly as Leisler,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

although, when he saw Robert Livingston, one of the anti-Leislerian leaders, in the gazing crowd, he exclaimed: "You have caused the King that I must now die, but before God's tribunal I will implead you for the same."

Only when we know all these facts, and many others that throw upon the whole story a very different light from the one that Mr. Fiske reads it by, can we understand why the Leislerian party retained its title and its vitality for many years, and was strong enough to regain the upper hand in local affairs. But although Mr. Fiske reprints a few of the best-known among contemporary documents, it is plain that he did not master them all; and he refers his readers for fuller information, not to them, but to certain modern novels, although they may be found in such easily accessible works as the Documentary History of New York, the Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York, and the Collections of the Historical Society.

We need not follow Mr. Fiske through the concluding portions of his story of New York. But another word must be said about the attitude of mind in which he approached his theme.

I think that the chief reason why he approached the story of New Netherland less sympathetically than those of Virginia and New England may be found in his tendency to make the political condition of a community almost the sole test of its temper, its ideals, and its social state in the broad meaning of the term. He is genuinely interested in the development of liberal ideas, the growth and consolidation of popular freedom—otherwise he would hardly spend his time upon the history of the United States. But he identifies the love and enjoyment of liberty too closely with the character of current political institutions. Of course, the latter most often bear truthful, if incomplete, witness to the existence or absence of the former. But sometimes they do not, and such was the case in New Netherland, where natives of the freest and most advanced country in Europe found themselves under the despotic hand of a selfish mercantile corporation. The fact that these people did not greatly interest Mr. Fiske is proved by the half-humorous or patronizing tone he often adopts, even when he is not quoting Knickerbocker. And I think he would have been more deeply interested if he had more fully digested the truth that, in spite of untoward political conditions, these people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were more liberal, more progressive, more democratic than any others in the America of their time.

A few among many possible proofs of this assertion may suffice us here, if my readers will contrast the social state they indicate with that of the other colonies during their first fifty years. In New Amsterdam class distinctions were not recognized, and such slight social eminence as could be compassed was earned on the spot, and was as well within the reach of the humbly as of the nobly born. Sumptuary laws were not thought of in New Amsterdam, nor mandates in regard to minor matters of conduct as supposedly right or wrong. The education of women was considered as essential as that of men, and they were granted an exceptionally independent place in family life, and freedom to engage on their own account in commercial life even in its most important branches. Rights of entail were not recognized, and daughters shared equally with sons in their parents' estates. Men of all nations were welcomed to the colony on equal terms; such political rights as existed were not limited by any facts of birth or of faith; and in no other way was liberty of conscience infringed upon. The privilege of free thought was unquestioned, and even the passionate efforts of Stuyvesant to suppress free speech proved unavailing. Excepting along the political path, individualism had a much freer chance to develop among the Dutch Americans than among the New Englanders, while the men of Massachusetts and New Haven were far from free even politically, for the value of their republican institutions was impaired by the narrow, undemocratic spirit in which they were administered. The more we study the condition of New Amsterdam the more convinced we are that, if a modern American could pay it a visit, he might feel quite comfortably at home. Can we say as much of any place in early New England?

A recognition of the peculiarly strong democratic spirit of seventeenth century New York puts into an historian's hand the thread upon which the events in its story should be strung. If Mr. Fiske had firmly grasped this thread he would have told his story better at many important points. He would have noticed the fact that the semi-feudal patroonships did not flourish in the neighborhood of New Amsterdam. He would have emphasized more strongly the way in which, during the Indian wars of Governor Kieft, the people seized their first slender chance to claim a share

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the management of their own concerns. He would have set in a truer light the stages of the struggle in which Van der Donck and Stuyvesant figured, accentuating the essentially Dutch character of the people's demands, and calling attention to the fact that the English among them did not help but deliberately hindered their efforts. He would have described more faithfully than he has done the temper of the province while it was ruled by its first English governor. He would have treated the events of Leisler's time more intelligently, showing how largely they were determined by the recent birth of an aristocratic party in New York. He would have seen something more than "what would have been a ludicrous farce if it had not been so execrably wicked" in the prosecution of Nicholas Bayard by the Leislerian party in 1702, and would not have called it a mere scheme of revenge for the execution of Leisler and Milborne. He would have noticed the trial of Francis Makemie in 1706, which settled the question of religious liberty for New York and struck the first direct blow at the royal prerogative. He would have mentioned the remarkable series of Resolutions passed by the Assembly in 1708, and sundry other bold legislative utterances and deeds which illustrated the steady intention of the royal province to widen its liberties. And thus he would have given a fine dramatic and a right historical effectiveness to his really excellent account of the Zenger trial in 1734.

This trial of a newspaper editor for libel and treason because he had criticised the government should have been set in its true light as the natural climax of a long conflict—as the natural result of New Amsterdam's liberal spirit and its belief in the right of free speech, persistent for a hundred years in spite of political conditions more unfavorable to their development than those of any other colony. And if Mr. Fiske had done this he would surely have completed his account of the Zenger trial with a word that now is lacking. He would not merely have said that it "deserves mention in every account of the development of political liberty." He would have underlined the fact that its result—the establishment of freedom of the press for all the colonies—was the greatest victory compassed in America by the democratic spirit before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and the one that made all others possible.

M. G. Van Rensselaer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TRADE UNIONISM AFFECTS BRITISH INDUSTRIES.

BY BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

In a recent number of this REVIEW,* the present writer endeavored to expose the fallacies on which is based the theory that British commerce has declined, and is now declining. The object then was to show that Britons need not yet prepare to write "Ichabod" over their Bourses, and to yield the palm of supremacy to their brothers across the Atlantic or to their cousins over the North Sea. The foreign trade of the United States and of Germany may go on growing larger without that of Great Britain necessarily becoming smaller. But I went on to say that, while British foreign commerce has not really suffered, as the pessimists assume, from the impact of American and German competition, and that, while British manufacturers and traders are not the fatuous beings that consular agents, globe-trotters and irresponsible writers generally would have the world imagine, British trade is really suffering from a malady of British origin. ("It is Trade Unionism that cripples us by enhancing the costs of production, and by constantly restricting the output.") Unfortunately, this is not so well understood as it ought to be—is not, indeed, recognized by many who address themselves to the discussion of Anglo-American industrial competition. That discussion proceeds on both sides of the Atlantic, but not always with consideration of how largely the competition is conditioned by labor. Let us look, then, for a little, at the incidence and effect of Trade Unionism on the industrial position of Great Britain.

In theory, the Trade Union is an organization for the protection of labor against the tyranny and oppression of capital.

*THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, October, 1900.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In practice, the British Trade Union is an organization for the restraint of labor and the manacling of capital. It is quite a mistake to regard the modern Trade Union simply as the lineal descendant and living representative of the old Trade Guild. The old Trade Guilds were combinations of masters and workmen for the promotion and protection of a trade or craft as a whole. The modern Trade Union is a combination for the sole purpose of furthering the supposed interests of the workmen, without regard to the interests of the trade or craft as a whole. In the old system, there was the element of solidarity in the relations between capital and labor. In the new system, there is the element of antagonism. In the old system, the craftsman prospered according to his skill and industry. In the new system, skill and industry are reduced to one common denominator, called the Trade Union rate of wage. If American manufacturers are enabled to undersell their British rivals in some of their pet industries, it is not because the American workman is a better craftsman than the British—he is, indeed, often imported from Britain—but because he is an unfettered producer. That is to say, American labor is more productive than British.

Now, as to the theory of Trade Unionism I do not propose to say anything here. It is generally regarded as admirable, and although a fair case can be made out against it, we must accept Trade Unionism as a great social, economic and, I regret to say, political institution. Let the theory be as beautiful as you please, the practice is abominable. In one respect, however, the modern Trade Union may be regarded as the heir of the mediæval Trade Guild. They are both examples of close corporations; and, even as the old Guilds, by their exactions and limitations, drove away crafts from the cities into the small country towns, so may the Trade Unions drive industries away from the country altogether. That they have actually done so we shall presently see.

The great object in American production is the saving of labor. The great object in British Trade Union production is the dissipation of labor—which is waste. This is the central idea of the "machine question" among the engineers, of the eight-hours-day movement, of the miners' weekly "idle day." The less each man does for his wages, the more will there be for other men to do for the same wages—so they foolishly think, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if there were a common wage fund into which every man can dip, share and share alike with his neighbor. This is why all labor-saving machinery is still hated by British workingmen, almost as much as it was in the days of the Luddites. Men do not smash machine-tools now-a-days, it is true; but they manage to get the minimum of work out of them, and to extract the maximum pay for attending to them. And that is why it has been computed that, if the numerals 1 to 1¼ be taken as representing the producing capacity of the British workman, 2¼ must be taken as representing the producing capacity (not the technical skill) of the American workman. The objects of the British Trade Unionist are—to equalize the wage of the mediocre or inferior and the capable workman; to restrict the amount of work done by each workman, so that there may be fewer unemployed; to restrict the total output, so that prices, and consequently wages, may not be borne down by the over-supply. In carrying out these objects, then, the British Trade Unions are neither more nor less than organizations for the restraint of labor and the curtailment of production.

Let me draw upon what I have written elsewhere, in illustration of what has just been said. I have been branded for denouncing Trade Unionism as a blight on our industrial system, as if I were something infinitely worse, even, than a person who could speak disrespectfully of the Equator. Without admitting that Trade Unionism has done all that is claimed for it in the raising of wages and the bettering of the condition of the working-class—changes which must have occurred in the natural order of things, as society developed—I do affirm that it has done much social and industrial harm. A workman, on joining one of these organizations, ceases to be a free agent; he becomes the slave of his society and the tool of its officials. Does that make for manliness, and individual energy, and social well-being? Individuality is submerged in the Union, which exists not for the good of each member, but for the society's own power and glory. For this reason, the officials and leaders discourage every form of effort and enterprise—such as piece-work and profit-sharing—which might have the effect of weakening the bond between the worker and the Union; and they encourage the inferior workman by establishing a maximum standard of work, so as to increase the membership and the power of the Union.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By insisting on a uniform rate of wages in an industry, they exact the highest pay for the lowest merit, and thus make inefficient labor dear. They have eliminated the spirit of emulation from the workshop, and have severed the old personal bond of sympathy and respect between the employer and his craftsmen. How can an operative be a faithful servant, when his first duty is not to his employer but to his society? The real creed of the Trade Unions is, that it is the right and duty of every workingman to get as much money as he can out of his employer, and to do as little for it as possible. Of course, no such creed is formulated, or even admitted; but what are the facts? That, upon the Trade Union scales of time-wages, the incompetent man is paid as highly as the competent man, which does not encourage the bad workman to become better, but does induce the good workman to become less efficient. What encouragement has the capable man to do his best, when he sees the "duffer" alongside of him earning as much money by idling and bungling as he does by good work? But do not think that the Trade Unions could have been referred to by the Psalmist when he said:

> "Behold how good a thing it is
> And how becoming well,
> Together, such as brethren are,
> In unity to dwell,"

for, often and often, employers have to be called in to arbitrate in disputes between the several societies quarrelling among themselves. The Unionists do not always accept the awards; indeed, they sometimes "strike" against them, even when the arbitrator is one of their own choosing, and of their own class. A curious illustration of the latter point has been afforded by the Joiners and Shipwrights' Societies on the Tyne, Unions which are continually squabbling over the "demarcation" of work. In one furious quarrel, a few years ago, reference was made to arbiters who could not agree. They called in, as umpire, Mr. Thomas Burt, one of the most respected Labor Members of Parliament. He decided in favor of the Shipwrights, but the Joiners refused to accept the award in an arbitration to which they had consented, and they struck work, remaining on strike for several months, to the serious loss of the employers, who had nothing to do with the dispute. The year after this dispute, and also on the Tyne, occurred a collision between the Society of Machinists,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known as the A. S. E.,* and the Society of Plumbers, also concerning the "demarcation" of work. The engineers struck, and for two months rejected all proposals of conciliation or arbitration, until the employers threatened to lock out twenty-five per cent. of all members of the A. S. E. (the largest Union in the world) if this matter were not at once arranged. Then a conference was agreed to, but the engineers broke away from the settlement and renewed the strike, whereupon all the employers in the district locked out all the A. S. E. men in their employ, and there was idleness in the shipyards for several months. Nothing whatever was gained by either Society from this dispute, but it threw another heavy loss upon the whole industry, and upon persons in no way responsible for it.

The contests have been legion in which the members of the A. S. E. have sought to obtain a monopoly of the labor, and a fixing of the rates of wages, in connection with the operation of all machine-tools in an engine-shop, no matter how simple and automatic such machines may be. By a succession of strikes at various places, the A. S. E. tried to compel the engineering employers to refuse to give employment to members of the Association of Machine Workers—an organization that refused to be absorbed in the A. S. E. These struggles, which led up to and culminated in the great strike of 1897-98, were of a twofold character. They were both against a rival Union, and for a monopoly of unskilled labor at the price of skilled labor; and the point of interest in what is known as the Machine Question, with reference to the subject of this article, is that the design was to limit the labor of each machine man to one machine, though it might be such as a child could supervise, and to limit the output of each machine to what the Trade Union officials, not the employers, should specify as the maximum. Over and over again, before this question was settled by the Employers' Federation taking up a determined front and bringing the A. S. E. to its knees, engine-shops were "struck" on the demand that obnoxious members of the Machine Workers' Association should be dismissed. But the Machine Workers retaliated when they could, and have, in turn, been known to "strike" a shop in which they were numerically strong, until an A. S. E. man was dismissed from employment at a machine-tool.

*Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These same machine workers have themselves afforded a curious illustration of the demoralizing effects of Trade Unionism. They are usually men who have been raised from the ranks of engine-shop laborers—that is to say, unskilled men taught by skilled foremen how to attend to machines. Yet these men, after promotion and organization in a Trade Union of their own, have been known to protest against the employment of other men promoted in the same way—afraid, of course, of having the ranks of machine-tenders overcrowded! Still another curious instance may be mentioned. In all shipyards there is a large employment of men of all sorts for general purposes apart from the skilled workers. The men employed ordinarily in this nondescript work have a Laborers' Union of their own; but in dull times, when employment is slack and a skilled artisan cannot obtain work at his own particular craft, he may be willing to take a temporary job as laborer until the clouds roll by. But taking a leaf out of the book of the A. S. E., the Laborers' Union have sometimes attempted to prevent this, by insisting that employers should not take on skilled operatives as laborers to the prejudice of their Union! Unskilled labor, however, is too plentiful for this design to succeed, as a rule.

In the evidence laid before the Senate Committee on the Shipping Subsidy Bill, and elsewhere in the public discussion of this measure, it has been stated that, notwithstanding the lower price of material, it costs from fifteen per cent. to twenty-five per cent. more to build a first-class steel steamer in the United States than in Great Britain. And this difference is generally ascribed to the cost of labor. The estimates on which these statements are based are very much questioned by British shipbuilders, and the theory as to wages is difficult for those to accept who know what Trade Unionism has done in British shipyards. For instance, the Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders' Society—not quite so large in membership as the A. S. E., but better managed and wealthier—has managed to absorb practically every workman engaged in the iron work of a shipyard and boiler-shop. In the structural work of an iron or steel ship, the principal laborers are the riveters, who work in squads and whose work is manual and muscular only, requiring a minimum of technical skill. These men, under the protection of their Union, obtain wages exceeding those of the most highly-skilled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

artisans in other industries, wages extravagantly out of proportion to the character and value of their work, wages so large that the recipients can afford to spend half a week in idleness and drink after every fortnightly pay. It is not conceivable that any class of workers in the United States receive such high pay for such low-grade work as do these riveters, or that in the United States they would be allowed to work so intermittently. There is no doubt that the extravagant wages and expensive methods of working established in the British shipyards by Trade Unionism have been the main cause of the diversion of many orders to German shipbuilders. If the wage-bill of the American shipbuilder is heavier than that of the British, in proportion to results, then is there small hope of shipbuilding becoming a great industry in the United States. For there is a day of reckoning and reform coming in Britain.

In an earlier part of this article, it was said that Trade Unions may drive an industry away from the country altogether. They have already done so to a large extent, and in many instances they have driven an industry out of a district. It was, for example, the exactions and limitations of the Thames shipbuilders that drove the great shipbuilding industry from London to the northern rivers, where it has flourished ever since, while the Thames has now only one shipyard of any importance. It was the exactions and limitations of the Trade Unions that drove lace-making from Nottingham to Scotland. It was the exactions and limitations of Trade Unions that drove flint glass-making from England to Germany, and bottle-making from Scotland to Belgium.

The story of the flint-glass trade is a very instructive one. This used to be a very extensive and lucrative business in Great Britain, affording highly-paid employment to many thousands of workers. These workers had, of course, their Trade Union. The Union waxed fat, and kicked on the question of apprentices. And it succeeded in enforcing a strict limitation to the number of boys to be allowed to enter the trade in any one year or in any one factory. Having secured this, they put the screw on wages until they raised the pay of an ordinary journeyman to between three pounds ten shillings and four pounds a week. The monopoly of labor was complete, but not the monopoly of supply. The Germans stepped in and took the trade bodily from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the nose of the Flint-glass Makers' Union, which now does not, in the whole United Kingdom, contain as many members as there are workers in many a single factory in Germany. The industry has gone, save two or three high-class concerns making costly tableware for the wealthy; and with it the workers, who either emigrated to America, or sought employment in other overcrowded avenues. Much the same kind of thing happened in the bottle-making industry. Apprentices and production were kept down, and wages were forced up, until bottles became so dear that Belgium sailed in and "scooped the market." German table-glass and Belgian bottles now tell the tale, in every British household, of what aggressive and tyrannical Trade Unionism can do for the industries of the country. Let it be noted that the initial cause of the ruin of these industries was the limitation placed on apprenticeship, for that is one of the most dangerous and lamentable features of Trade Unionist policy as still pursued.

I have written elsewhere that, while Trade Unionism has not raised the rewards of honest labor, it has put a premium on inefficiency, by insisting that the idle and incompetent worker shall be placed on a wage-level with the most skilful and most industrious. Those who support the demand of Trade Unions for a minimum wage, and those politicians who contend for what is known as the "Fair Wage" clause in public contracts, do not stop to consider the demoralizing character of these demands. Instead of honest toil, it means the "Trade Union Stroke;" and the "Trade Union Stroke" means compelling the most highly-gifted artisan to slow down to the pace of the most slovenly. It means yielding the smallest possible amount of real labor for the largest possible day wage. And the insertion of the so-called "Fair Wage" clause in State and Municipal contracts is designed to make the Trade Unions masters of the situation wherever public work is concerned—the endeavor being to maintain that fair wages are the standard rates, and the standard rates must be approved by the Trade Societies.

The extent to which Trade Union influences may curtail production and demoralize the workmen was very conclusively shown by the instances collected by the Federated Engineering Employers during the great strike of 1897-98. Let us note a few. One firm had been compelled by the A. S. E., before the strike, to turn over a couple of simple copying-lathes to two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of the A. S. E. at thirty-five shillings per week each, the cost of attending the two machines being thus seventy shillings a week. After the strike, a laborer was trained and put in charge of both machines at a wage of twenty-four shillings per week, which was a large increase on his previous wage; and he, singly, got more work out of the two machines than had both the A. S. E. men.

In another case, a promoted laborer, replacing an A. S. E. man on strike, did in 135 hours certain work on a planing-machine over which the Union man had always taken 190 hours.

In another case, a man who resigned from the Society at the time of the strike, and retained his job, did daily, as a free worker, twice the amount of work he had previously done as a member of the Union.

In other cases, the statements are so startling that we will quote the exact words of the report authenticated by the Employers' Federation:

"A. reports that, when making ammunition boxes for six-pounder cartridges some years ago, it was found that, in finishing up the hinges, any member of the society employed on the job used always to do exactly eight in a day. The foreman in charge knew that this was not a day's work, and he changed the men; but, in every case, notwithstanding that considerable changes were made, the union men made exactly eight per day. A young Swiss (non-Unionist), who did not speak English, was then put on the job, and the first day he did fifty. The same firm report that, in filing up the outside handles of machine-guns, it was found that any member of the society working on the job generally did one a day. The firm knew that this was not a day's work, but were unable to get a society man to do more. The work was then given to a gun-filer not belonging to any society, and he did twelve a day."

Dozens of instances might be cited, did space permit, from this remarkable report, showing the deadly effect of Trade Unionism on the energy, morality and capability of the workers, and also the efforts of Trade Unionists to demoralize and restrain the industry of apprentices. Each case is supported by documentary evidence, and the whole black record is one to make every honest workingman sick with shame. Yet the men referred to are not common laborers; they are skilled and clever artisans, men of some education, to whom the term "respectable" would be generally applied. And their Society is the largest and most assertive Trade Union in the world, with ramifications in both Hemispheres and at the Antipodes. Let it not be forgotten

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that, in these mechanical trades, the British workman has for thirty years had the nine-hours day for which his American colleague, as competitor, is only now striving. And if the Trade Unionist had had his way, it would have been reduced to eight hours three years ago, with amplified restrictions on piece-work, apprentices, over-time, machine-tools, and so forth. If he had had his way, how much work would have been left to him by this time?

Not to dwell too much on one branch of industry, let us look around. In a recent number of *The Nineteenth Century*, Mr. William Woodward threw a flood of light upon the operation of Trade Unionism in the trades with which he, as an architect, is in the habit of coming in contact. These trades are rather of domestic than of international interest; but we turn to Mr. Woodward for further illustration of the methods of British workmen generally.

Mr. Woodward says that under the new working rules which were agreed upon last year between the representatives of the London Master Builders' Association and, respectively, the Operative Bricklayers, the Operative Stonemasons and the Carpenters and Joiners' Societies, the working hours of these trades in summer are fifty per week for forty weeks; during twelve weeks of winter, the working hours are, for the first three weeks and the last three weeks, forty-seven hours per week; and during the six middle weeks, forty-four hours per week. The rate of wages was to be advanced one halfpenny per hour, from certain dates in 1900 and 1901. Supposing that the men worked on Saturdays the same number of hours as on other days, this would give eight hours as the average length of the working day for the six days in the week; or, in other words, about one-third of the six days and nights of a working week devoted to labor, the other two-thirds, plus the whole of Sunday, being devoted to rest, study and pleasure. How much of that time is given to pleasure? Hear Mr. Woodward:

"It might be reasonably assumed that the decrease in the hours of labor, and the increase in wages, must result in improvement to the minds of the workmen, the laying up of a little store for future old age, and in extra comforts for the wives and children. We know that the men are paid at noon on Saturday, and that many of them are not seen again on the building till the Tuesday morning following. It may be that they have been studying the handiwork of their predecessors in the South Kensington Museum, or that they have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

giving the benefit of their practical knowledge to some of the pupils of the technical schools, or have been doing a little work in the garden. That I do not know; but I do know that, at the dinner-hour on the Tuesday, some of the men who have taken three pounds or so on the Saturday cannot get their dinner till they have borrowed the price of it from the foreman, so that the increase of wage has resulted in loss of work to the master (itself of the utmost importance), and has conferred no benefit whatever upon the workman or upon his family."

This, of course, is well enough known to employers of labor and to the leaders of such Trade Unions as the Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders' Society, against whose members it is a standing complaint that they lose half a week in drinking after every fortnightly pay-day. This is no invention of the employers. The members of this Society have been slated and rated repeatedly by their own officials for their intemperance and irregularities.

Let us now notice a few restrictive peculiarities in the building trades to which Mr. Woodward refers:

"A bricklayer in some kind of work can well lay 1,200 bricks a day, but in the ordinary run of work he can easily lay, on the average, 750. Rules, however, step in which absolutely fix him not to exceed 500. If the bricklayer catches a plasterer fixing a wall-tile nine inches by three inches, he is again at the foreman to stop it, not however, if the tile is six inches by six inches. Bricklayers have recently made up their minds that roof-tiling is their work, and not that of the regular tiler who thoroughly knows his work. So, unless this work, which they do not understand, is given over to the bricklayers, and the tilers dismissed, the bricklayers strike the job. If the eagle eye of the plasterer observes a man fixing a fireproof plaster material—that is to say, a man sent off by the manufacturer of the material, and who is a unionist—off that man has to go, notwithstanding the important fact that he thoroughly understands his particular work, and that the ordinary plasterer does not. The resulting defective work has to be ultimately made good, at the cost of the master or building owner. This same plasterer has also prevented, by his Society, any superfluity of apprentices. The present race of plasterers mean to have plenty of work in their time; let the future of the trade take care of itself. The mason, too, also on the lookout, sees a bricklayer fixing a piece of stone to take the end of a girder; that is soon stopped; and the mason leaves his legitimate work to come and set this piece of stone, whilst the bricklayer looks on and perhaps smokes his cigarette—and so on."

Is this the dignity of labor, or sheer tom-foolery? The amiable inventor of the Busy Bee of the nursery world informs us that hands were made for honest labor. How are we to characterize the labor of men who do not give more than four hours'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real work for the eight hours for which they are paid, who idle openly and who take pride in being paid for work which they do not do? One of the great problems of the day is how to provide decent dwellings for the poor at rents within their precarious means. The social reformers do not seem to be aware how that problem has been intensified by the action of the Bricklayers' and other Trade Unions. By the prevailing system of organized idleness, and incessant interference with the employer, the cost of building workmen's dwellings has been increased about one-third within the last fifteen years. And yet all the talk is not how to teach these men morality and common-sense, but how to provide them with Technical Education! Great Heavens! as if Technical Colleges will enable us to preserve our industries, if our workmen will not work!

Not only will a Trade Unionist not work more than his Union will permit him to do, but the Trade Unionist will not allow any other man to work, if he can prevent it. Away from his Union, the British operative is as good a fellow and as keen and capable a worker as you can find the world over. Under the blight of Trade Unionism, he is shrivelled and demoralized—alike the slave, the scout and the pander of his Union—ready to hurl forth with curses any outsider who dares to lay a hand upon the sacred Ark in a "Union Shop."

Contrast with all that has been said about the restrictions of labor by machinists and of the output of machine-tools in Great Britain, the following from a statement by Mr. George O. Draper, secretary of one of the largest manufacturing companies in the United States, concerning labor in the American cotton industry:

> "In spinning, the product of the machine has practically doubled in the last thirty years, and the capacity of the operative has not only doubled with the machine, but has trebled or even quadrupled. The improvement has been of such a nature that the increase in speed has been attended with benefit to the product. In weaving, the product per operative has easily trebled; it is certain that the product per operative in other departments of a cotton mill has at least doubled. Formerly, a weaver tended but one loom, and that at a moderate speed. To-day weavers on the Northrop looms often tend twenty-four machines, running at a speed nearly double that of the original power looms."

In Great Britain, a machinist in an engine-shop who dares attempt to drive more than one machine is hauled up before his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

District Committee, sternly reprimanded and heavily fined. If he offends again, he may be summarily dismissed from the Society, with forfeiture of all the benefits for which he has been contributing all his life.

A good deal of emotional nonsense has been written about the compulsory Arbitration Law of New Zealand, and its effect in eliminating strikes. It is practically a law for the glorification of Trade Unionism, since it affords protection only to workmen who are members of some Trade Union; though, to be sure, it recognizes any perfunctory and loose-jointed combination of men as a Union. The following are the leading features of this remarkable law which both Great Britain and the United States are called upon to imitate:

1. Under it individual employees cannot invoke arbitration. 2. Employees can secure legal standing only through a Trade Union. 3. Trade Unions must be incorporated and registered for the purposes of the law. 4. The decisions of the arbitration courts are final and binding for specified periods, and under penalty of fines. 5. No strike or lockout can be declared for the purpose of defeating a contemplated recourse to arbitration by either party. 6. When a strike or lockout occurs, the arbitration court may, at the request of either party, and within a given time, order a return to work pending a formal trial of the dispute. 7. Employees cannot leave their Unions during arbitration, or while a decision is in force, for the purpose of evading its terms, except upon giving three months' notice. 8. Employees may be discharged at any time, for any reason other than that of defeating an award. 9. Rulings of the courts upon hours, wages, employment of Trade Unionists, and other conditions of trade, although rendered at the instance of a single body, may be declared applicable to all employees within any given area. 10. Legal counsel is not allowable, except by consent of both parties. 11. The court of arbitration, at any time during an award, reserves the right to adjudge obnoxious any act of either party, and may punish it by the usual proceedings of committal and attachment. 12. The awards of the courts cannot be set aside for any informality, or challenged, appealed against, reviewed, quashed or called in question by any court of judicature, on any account whatever. 13. The court of arbitration consists of three members, appointed by the Governor, one of whom is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recommended by the employers and one by the employees, while the third must be a judge of the Supreme Court.

All this sounds well; but one searches in vain for evidence of that perfect satisfaction with the results of which one has heard from the pamphleteers and platformers. As for the new *régime* which the laws were to institute, from which distrust and discord were to be banished, and in which there was to be a spirit of mutual confidence between employers and employed, it simply has not arrived. Mr. Dillingham, the United States Consul at Auckland, New Zealand, has made that clear enough in his official report on the subject. The abuses which the Labor Laws were designed to check have not been prevented. The lives of the working-classes in the Colony have not been made fuller and healthier. One need not ask why, when one learns that the Supreme Court has decided that non-Unionists are altogether outside the Act, and that, in fact, non-associated workmen have no legal status. In effect, with regard to such men, the Act abolishes contract, and decrees that Trade Unionists shall have preference over all other workmen at all times and in all circumstances. Such a law is unjust and iniquitous. A non-Unionist can only sell his labor at his own peril, if he can find an employer who will take the risk of having legal proceedings raised against him by a Trade Union. Is it conceivable that such a law can conduce to the preservation of the principle of mutuality and to the maintenance of perfect relations between masters and men? Yet glorification of the Trade Unionists would be precisely the effect (if it were rigidly carried out) of the "Fair Wages Resolution" of the House of Commons, to which reference will presently be made.

Mr. Brooks Adams recently called attention to what he characterized as a very curious phenomenon, in that in earlier days the manufactures of Great Britain were sold in America; the proceeds remitted to Lancashire or Yorkshire were, for the most part, spent in wages, and by the wage-earner expended for food; the sale of food paid the gentry's rent, and the gentry's accumulations either found their way back to Lancashire in the form of loans, or were invested in American stocks. Such was the condition, he says, when Bagehot wrote "Lombard Street," and then he goes on to describe what happened in the next two decades:

"The acreage under wheat in England, Scotland and Wales fell

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 3,490,000 acres, in 1873, to 1,897,000, in 1893; while imports of wheat rose from 43,863,000 hundred weight, in 1873, to 65,461,000, in 1893. Meanwhile, the population of the United Kingdom had only grown from 32,000,000 to 38,000,000. In other words, the imports of wheat had increased 50 per cent., and the population 20 per cent.; and this leaves out purchases of flour, which had swelled from 6,000,000 to 20,000,000 hundred weight."

Yes, but why did the acreage under wheat decline, and the imports under foodstuffs increase? For the same reason that the shipping industry of the United States declined in the same period—that is to say, Capital and Labor found more profitable employment. It has paid us better to turn our energies on to iron, steel, textile, and other manufactures, than on to corn; but we did not, as a nation, become less industrious or less prosperous. And now America, having founded her prosperity on farming, is looking for other lines of development. Naturally, she has developed most along the line of least resistance; but as, year by year, her economic condition approaches more near to that of Europe, so, year by year, will she find the resistance gathering. Mr. Brooks Adams makes the remarkable statement that "Carnegie achieved the new industrial revolution in March, 1897." He may have inaugurated, but he certainly did not "achieve" it any more than Mirabeau "achieved" the French Revolution. And an industrial revolution may have, as its *sequelae,* a Laborist reign of terror and a Capitalist despotism.

Organization on the part of the employers of labor has never been so complete and general in Great Britain as organization of workers. No doubt, trade jealousy has had something to do with this; but even trade jealousy has to give way before the necessities of self-protection. The Associations of Coal-owners in Wales, in the Midlands and in the North of England have served fairly well in checking the aggressions of the coal-miners; but these Associations are local in character and have not the cohesion of the Miners' Federation of Trade Unions on the other side. And in recent disputes in the cotton industries of Lancashire and the building trades of London, the combinations of employers broke down and went under. The only thoroughly successful combinations of employers on a large scale are the Shipping Federation, which has completely routed the New Unionism in its effort to obtain control over both ships and docks, and the Engineering Employers' Federation, which de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feated the attempt of the allied Trade Unions in 1897 to obtain the management of all the engine-shops in the country, the allocation of work, the limitation of hours and the appraisement of labor. The last-named organization leaves each district Association of employers to manage its own local affairs, but conjoins all the districts to assist any one district or firm that may be assailed by the Unions. Thus, when in 1897 the engineers of the London district ("machinists," as they are called in America) went out on strike in order nominally to obtain an eight-hours day, but really to become the masters of their own employers, all the federated employers throughout the country locked out their men until the London strikers resumed work and submitted their demands for consideration and discussion. The strike was prolonged for six months, and cost both masters and men an enormous amount of money. But, from one point of view, it was one of the best things that have happened in modern industrial England, for it taught employers what they can do for the preservation of their industries and their independence by thorough organization against aggressive Trade Unionism; and it showed the Trade Unions that, far as they have gone, there is a point beyond which they will not be allowed to go, and that they are practically powerless against vigorous combinations of employers in any industry. It is only when defensive combinations of employers have lacked vigor and loyalty and a directing head that they have been defeated.

The tendency among employers now, therefore, is to draw together in groups for mutual support against a common foe—by which is meant not their own workmen, but those who would make the workmen only the pawns in the game. The movement will not be accelerated and strengthened, however, without war. Joint Boards of Conciliation, sliding-scale committees, and the like, are instruments for peace up to a certain point. They are powerless when a dispute becomes a struggle for mastery. In industrial as in political affairs, a display of strength is the best preservative of peace. There are, however, admirable schemes for the federation of masters and workmen on a national and patriotic basis, one of the most attractive of which is fathered by Mr. John Lockie. His great design is to bring about a Federation of all concerned in trade and trade questions, for educational purposes, for the promotion and advancement of the trade and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commerce of the country, and for the opening up and cultivation of foreign markets by Bagman Missions composed of both employers and employed. Mr. Lockie's design, perhaps, goes further than is practicable or may be desirable; but there is certainly something fascinating in the idea of "a Federation where employers and employed can meet on all occasions on the same plane," and be enabled to "bring about a prompt and satisfactory settlement of disputes or strikes, whether affecting national or merely local interests." The proposed "Federated Council of all Employers' Associations and Trade Unions" is something like a Federation of Federations. But the country is not ripe for it. Employers in all trades have not yet learned the power for good of co-operation. And the law has not till now sufficiently defined and delimited the functions and responsibilities of Trade Unions. At present, no law can bind them to a common agreement, and they have more frequent and more bitter quarrels with each other than with their employers. The "Solidarity of Labor" is conspicuous by its absence, when one Trade Union is found trenching on the preserves of another.

As bearing on this, however, note the following resolution carried unanimously at the annual conference of the Labor Representation Committee (of Trade Unions, Trade Councils and Socialist Societies) held at Manchester in February, 1901:

"That this conference declares that, in view of the combinations of capital and federations of employers, it is necessary for the Trade Unions of the country to use their political power to defend their existence and secure their demands; and, while it deprecates the introduction of mere party politics into the Trade Union movement, it urges upon Trade Unionists the necessity of combining on an independent platform for the following purposes: (1) The defence of the legal rights of combination; (2) The passing of such laws as will put an end to a system under which the producer of wealth has to bear an enormous burden, in the shape of rents and profits which go to maintain large classes of non-producers."

Observe the repetition of the old fallacies that labor is the sole source of wealth, and that only manual workers are producers!

But probably enough has been said to demonstrate the baneful action of Trade Unionism upon the national industrial life. It is difficult, of course, for the politician who has learned to pay tribute to Trade Unionism as a political force, and for the economist who has been taught to regard combinations of labor as institutions for promoting the greatest good of the greatest num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber, to acknowledge all this. We might show that Trade Unionism has failed on every one of the points on which its existence was justified and praised by the old Political Economists, but that is not the present purpose. A writer in *The Spectator* the other day said that "our artisans are, it cannot be doubted, in the great number of cases restrained from doing their best because their Trade Union has set a limit on individual production." This is putting it too mildly, for when one has a stern truth to face one need not mince phrases. And I affirm, unhesitatingly, that whatever may be the theory of Trade Unionism, it is working altogether on a false principle in Great Britain—that of restricting production. The application of this principle is increasing our costs and handicapping us in the industrial race. It springs from the fallacy that there is just a certain amount of work to be done in the world, which, spread out thin, will go all round the army of manual workers. It ignores the fact that work creates work, and that the more cheaply work can be done, the more there will be to do. It opposes the teaching of experience that, as machine-tools displace labor in one direction, they create more labor in another direction. If Great Britain fails in the industrial race, it will not be because her workmen cannot create as well as others, but that they will not. And we do not need to go much further than this in search of an explanation of the pressure of foreign competition—that a German or American workman will give equal attention simultaneously to three, four or six machines or tools, whilst the British workman is compelled by his Trade Union to limit his attention to one, so that employment may be given to half a dozen other men who ought to be busy elsewhere.

Britain's greatest national danger lies in the destruction of free-trade in labor. It threatens not only British industries, but also British defences, as has been seen in delays in the construction of warships caused by Trade Union obstructions. It is not so much technical education that is required as the awakening of the working-man to the fact that he becomes his own worst enemy when he joins a Trade Union. Meanwhile, the conditions of international competition will not be equalized until in America Trade Unionism has developed as it has done in Britain. And such development, if one may read the signs of the times, has already begun.

BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KATIPUNAN OF THE PHILIPPINES.

BY COLONEL L. W. V. KENNON, U. S. A.

It has been, perhaps, a matter of surprise to people in America that the insurrection in the Philippines should so long have been able to continue its existence, and many have attributed this to the valor of the Philippine soldiery. There could hardly be a greater mistake. The Philippine soldiery have not been able at any point to oppose even nominal resistance to the American occupation of every town and village in the Islands, and yet peace has not existed. The warlike conditions which have prevailed have been due, not to Philippine valor, but to the Katipunan, a powerful, all pervading, secret organization, nominally working for liberty, appealing to native ignorance and racial prejudice, dedicated to assassination, and bold and avowedly unscrupulous in the methods by which it attains its ends; a society which, without sanction of law or authority other than its own rules, assumed and freely exercised the power of punishing by death any person who disobeyed its mandates or otherwise incurred its displeasure, and which vested this power in the ignorant, local chiefs of its lodges throughout the Islands.

The object of the following pages is to trace briefly the history, purposes and work of this society. The facts presented have been obtained from native Philippine sources, or have come directly under the personal observation of the writer.

Until the advent of the Americans, the conditions which existed in the Philippines, outside of Manila, were truly mediæval in character. The Church and the State held joint authority; the sole duty of the people was obedience; of recognized rights, they had none. The towns were presided over by a municipal captain who received his orders from the provincial governor,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

usually a soldier. The municipal captain was a native appointed, it would seem, on the recommendation of the curate, who was ordinarily a member of the regular clergy, or, as he was commonly termed, a friar. In later years, so-called elections were held, but the result was the same; the person selected by the friars was duly returned by the subservient voters, who comprised only the officials and property-owners of the town. The great mass of the people were dependent upon the proprietors, who were their feudal lords, they being obedient slaves.*

The real power in the eyes of the people was the friar, and he is charged with all manner of extortion and outrage. He is said to have been greedy of land and money, and to have lived in comparative splendor, at the expense of the people, in magnificent "convents," built for him by the forced labor and contributions of parishioners. He is charged with assuming the reins of civil government, while neglecting his proper duties of instructing the people, who were taught merely the formulas of the Roman Catholic Church and obedience to the priests.

General ignorance prevailed. Some learned the Spanish language, but ambition to study seems to have been repressed, and the reading of books not approved by the friars was, in practice, ground for deportation, the writing of them a capital offense. The way to a profession was made long and difficult; twelve years of study, at least, were required before a diploma would be granted which would enable a Filipino to practise a profession.

Since the opening of the Suez Canal, a few Filipinos, by favor, or as exiles, have been educated in Europe. Generally, however, the education of the people was discouraged.

For more than three centuries, these conditions obtained in the Islands, and a feeling of bitterness against the government at length arose, taking the form of opposition to the friars, and protests were made against their exactions; the power of the Church, however, was greater than that of Governors-General, and no heed was paid to the protests of the people.

The Tagals are, probably, the dominating tribe among the Philippine natives. Their home is the country around Manila and in the neighboring provinces. They have been, for this reason, brought more in contact with the Spaniards, and have

*The conditions existing in the Philippines from a native viewpoint may be studied in the novel, "Noli me Tangere," by Dr. José Rizal, a Filipino educated in Europe. The reading of this book was prohibited.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seen more of a civilization of which they had little part. It was natural that the contrast between Spaniards and natives should be noted there, that the discontent of the latter should be greater, and that there first should be found an organized opposition to their rulers.

It was in Manila, on the 7th of July, 1892, that the Katipunan Society of the Philippines was organized under the name of the "Supreme and Venerable Association of the Sons of the People," the word "katipunan" meaning association or society.

The founder and "soul of the society" was Andrés Bonifacio, an employee in a brick-yard. The purposes of the organization were stated to be the political, social and moral elevation of the Tagal race. The society grew rapidly in Manila and the Tagal provinces; and in July, 1896, the number of members was variously reported to be from 12,000 to 15,000. In the beginning, the formulas of Masonry were employed, but these were simplified to adapt them to the grade of intelligence of its members, who belonged to the lowest classes, and who are stated to have been "copyists, common soldiers, washermen, wood-gatherers, shoemakers and laborers"; the only person of education connected with the society was Dr. Pio Valensuela, who was initiated in 1895.*

When a new lodge was opened, a triangle was formed called *"Hasik,"* or seed plot; and an equilateral triangle and three K's were the distinctive symbols of the Society. There were three degrees; a simple cipher and secret signs were adopted. The initiation ceremonies were made solemn and terrifying, to impress the candidate and to test his valor. He was first questioned in a cabinet, and then introduced into a dimly lighted room, where, upon a table draped in black, were a human skull, a loaded revolver, a bolo, or short native sword, and a paper upon which were written questions which he was required to answer. After this, various other tests were applied, followed by the administering of the oath, which was signed with blood taken from the left forearm of the candidate, who was then declared a member of the lowest degree.

The Supreme Council consisted of a President, Secretary,

*Much information concerning the early history of the Katipunan may be found in "La Religión del Katipunan," Madrid, 1900, by Isabelo de los Reyes, a Filipino, whose work has been largely consulted in the foregoing account.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Syndic, Treasurer and six members. This Council and the presidents of local lodges formed the Assembly.

Twenty-five women were admitted, to quiet their suspicions of the nocturnal excursions of their husbands. They were told that the object of the society was simply mutual aid. The Katipunan did, in fact, aid its sick and bury its dead, paying the expenses of funerals, "but always at the lowest rates, so as not to enrich the priests." The moral objects of the society were the teaching of democratic ideas, and an opposition to religious fanaticism as expressed in the teaching of the friars, "who obscured rather than explained religious truths." The political objects were the securing for the Philippines the reforms granted to Cuba, and the limiting of the power of the friars.

Copies of the "Rights of Man," and a history of the French Revolution, as well as other works, including treatises on military tactics and on the manufacture of powder and dynamite, were circulated among the members.

A secret society of supposed Masonic tendencies and origin, which distributed incendiary literature, and which organized large numbers of the lowest elements of the native population into a coherent body in opposition to the existing government, could not fail to be obnoxious to the Spanish authorities. Efforts were made to suppress it, and the mark of initiation was ground for the imprisonment of the person bearing it.

This was the situation in 1896. Andrés Bonifacio was the President, elected on the 1st of January, and Emilio Aguinaldo presided over the lodge at Cavite. Aguinaldo was then twenty-six years of age, and municipal captain of Cavite Viejo. Having occasion to visit Cavite to receive the orders of the Provincial Governor, he learned that a list of the members of the Katipunan had fallen into the hands of the Spaniards, and that the priest at Cavite Viejo was endeavoring to cause his arrest. He hastened back to his town, and, with the aid of his lieutenants, called together the members, explained to them their danger, and with them took up arms against the Spaniards. This was on the 26th of August, 1896. Within five days, Aguinaldo and his adherents had taken possession of nearly every town in the province, surprising the small garrisons and securing their arms. The insurrection spread rapidly throughout the Tagal provinces, where the Katipunan had been established. Andrés Bonifacio was killed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is believed, at the instigation of Aguinaldo, and the latter assumed control of the society and of the forces in the field.*

The Spaniards sent a large force against the insurgents, and in eight months, or by May, 1897, had utterly routed them and driven their chief and a remnant of his forces to seek refuge in the mountains of the eastern coast. Here, after his defeat, and while a fugitive in the inaccessible fastnesses of wild and unknown mountains, Aguinaldo states that he proclaimed a Philippine Republic, and opened up negotiations with the Spanish Governor-General, Primo de Rivera. As a result, the "Treaty of Biak-na-Baté" was signed on the 14th of December, 1897, by the terms of which Aguinaldo and those who wished to follow him were "free to live on foreign soil," and were to receive $800,000 as "indemnity," the money to be delivered personally to Aguinaldo. All arms were to be delivered to the Spanish authorities, who were to place two Generals in Aguinaldo's hands as hostages for the delivery of the first installment ($400,000) of the indemnity. Aguinaldo also avers that by this treaty Rivera agreed to suppress religious orders in the Islands and to grant autonomy, though these provisions were not reduced to writing.

More than one thousand rifles were delivered to the Spanish authorities, and the first installment of the indemnity was turned over to Aguinaldo; the second was never paid. The insurrection was at an end; the *Te Deum* was sung in the churches and normal conditions prevailed throughout the Philippines.†

So began and ended the insurrection of 1896. It lasted about fourteen months, and the operations on both sides seem to have been conducted with great cruelty. The insurgents burnt and sacked churches and convents, and many friars were murdered. The insurrection "was begun without any definite political object" whatever,‡ but was merely a desperate and successful effort on the part of Aguinaldo and his fellow members of the Katipunan to escape imprisonment by the Spanish Government. It ended by the buying off of the leaders, as above stated, and the society which gave rise to it was, for the time being, suppressed.

*"I do not now care to inquire into the death of Andrés Bonifacio, for, in truth, I know nothing of the facts in the case, and I am glad of it, since, perhaps, all that might be said of it would be in derogation of one or the other of the two gigantic figures of our revolution." "Religión del Katipunan," p. 40.

†This account of the insurrection and the treaty is taken from the "Religión del Katipunan," and from the "Reseña Veridica de la Revolución Filipina," by Emilio Aguinaldo, Tarlac, 1899.

‡Circular addressed to Spaniards, Cavite, June 30, 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the outbreak of war between the United States and Spain, Aguinaldo and his exiled companions saw an opportunity by which they might secure a prize which hitherto had never entered their wildest dreams. Pending the outbreak of hostilities, they had been interviewed by the naval and civil officers of our government, for the purpose of securing information as to conditions then existing in the Philippines, and ascertaining whether the natives would be friendly or hostile to the Americans. With the enthusiasm of youth, they thought that they might perhaps get control of the Philippines; their imagination carried them still further, and they dreamed of a general Malay Empire, wherein all of that race should be subject to Tagals of Luzon.

As a first step, they decided, in a meeting held in Hong-Kong on May 4th, 1898, to aid the Americans, to secure arms from them, and then, if the Islands were not delivered to themselves, to use those arms to drive the Americans into the sea.

Aguinaldo accordingly returned to the Philippines, and landing at Cavite under American protection, proceeded to gather his adherents about him. Arms were furnished them, and they moved against the outlying Spanish garrisons, most of which surrendered after a slight resistance, for want of ammunition. On the 24th of May, Aguinaldo declared himself Dictator of the Islands, and on the 12th of June he proclaimed the independence of the Philippines.

The first troops from America arrived on June 30th; these were followed by others, and by August 1st the Americans numbered about 10,000 men. Manila surrendered to the forces of the United States on the 13th of August. Aguinaldo desired to loot the city, claiming that his troops were entitled to a share of the booty, but he was informed that the town would not be sacked, and compelled to move his troops outside its limits.

Pending the ratification of the Treaty of Paris, no move was made by the American troops. On January 4th, General Otis proclaimed the sovereignty of the United States over the Islands. On the 26th, Aguinaldo announced a Philippine Republic, with himself as President.

Since his arrival, he had worked unremittingly toward the accomplishment of the purposes and plans mapped out in Hong-Kong. At the suggestion of Sandico, the author of the plan to slay without mercy and spare no person of white skin in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Philippines, the Katipunan was revived; Aguinaldo announced that all Filipinos were members of the society, whether they wished or not, and a new Katipunan was formed, whose objects were the expulsion of the Americans and the "liberty of the country." Its emissaries, backed by military force, were sent to all parts of the Islands. The natives, who but recently were enthusiastic in their reception of the Americans, were turned against them, the ready credulity of an ignorant people accepting without hesitancy the wildest tales of Yankee treachery, cruelty and savagery which were told them. Prominent men who declined to join the movement were put to death, "to encourage the others." It was announced that all who were not with the proposed insurrection were traitors and should die. The newly appointed presidents of towns were required to take an oath that they would never serve any but the government declared by Aguinaldo. Head men and proprietors who were forced or induced to join, initiated their people. By every means in their power, the leaders endeavored to cultivate a national sentiment. Some even proposed a national religion, Bathalism, an idealized form of the primitive religion of the Islands, and the worship of God under the ancient name of Bathala.

A numerous army was raised and equipped and every preparation made for attacking the Americans, who with their small force occupied Manila and the immediately surrounding country. Open hostilities were begun on February 4th, 1899. The self-restraint previously exercised by the American soldiery had been misunderstood by the Filipinos, who had taken it for a sign of fear; they were undeceived at the first battle, and were driven back at all points; in the brief campaign that followed, they were pushed as far as the small number of our troops would with safety allow. The necessity for the return of the volunteers, who had enlisted only for the war with Spain, prevented the immediate termination of the struggle, and much of the ground gained had to be relinquished in order to protect the vitally important positions about Manila. On the arrival of the new volunteers in October, 1899, active operations were at once resumed; the organized armies of the insurrection were speedily dispersed, and every inhabited part of the Islands occupied by our troops. Aguinaldo was a fugitive, hiding in the mountains of the north, and his so-called Government completely destroyed. The stake played for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the Hong-Kong conspirators, who represented nobody but themselves, was evidently lost. To all reasoning men, the futile wickedness of continuing the struggle was apparent, but whether in the hope of making another profitable treaty with the Americans, or encouraged to a vain hope of ultimate success by the false assurances of their representatives, who were enjoying life in foreign capitals, and by the utterances of some people in America, with a childish inability to grasp the facts of the situation the native leaders determined upon a species of warfare which is denounced and outlawed by all civilized nations. The so-called guerrilla tactics adopted consisted mainly of assassination. Our soldiers were avoided. A few small and scattered bands remained under arms, more as personal guards for the chiefs and a means of terrorizing the natives than as effective units for the conduct of military operations. They hid in mountain retreats and in the recesses of the dense forests of the plains, attacking only when the chances were overwhelmingly in their favor. The great majority of the insurgents dispersed to their homes, hid their arms and resumed the appearance and pursuits of peaceful life in towns occupied by American troops. In a strictly military sense the war was over, but neither peace nor tranquillity had been restored. The insurrection continued, its forces being now directed, not against the Americans, but against the natives.

It has been stated that the Katipunan was revived, and that all Filipinos had been declared members of the fraternity whether they wished or not. The President of the society was also President of the so-called Republic, and the Captain-General of its armies. The Government and the Katipunan were practically one, and the symbols of the latter appeared on the seals and stamps of the former. Military operations had failed, the Government had fallen, and its armies were dispersed. The end now sought was to prevent the people from accepting the government of the United States, and the Katipunan was entrusted with this task. The Tagal leaders had, by this time, realized that they were too weak to accomplish alone the designs with which they had started out. In the first days of their power they had ruthlessly overridden the other tribes and had committed numerous outrages, murders and robberies upon them. The feeling of hostility against the Tagals had caused the Americans to be warmly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

welcomed in many parts of the Islands. The Katipunan now appealed to all Filipinos, took for its motto the words, "Union, Equality and Fraternity," declaring that it took no regard of "pride of position and dialect, by which a person being rich sets himself above the poor, or being Tagal, above the Ilocano, Pangasinan, Visayano," etc. The tribes mentioned are those which had probably suffered most under the brief Tagal rule.

After American occupation was complete throughout the Archipelago, the Katipunan, aided by secrecy, by force and by the character of the people, spread throughout the country, pervading every town and hamlet, and striking terror into every native household. The people were forbidden, under pain of death, to accept any office under the Americans; or, accepting it, were compelled also to subscribe to an agreement to obey the orders of the Katipunan, or the military chiefs hiding in their neighborhood, and to collect contributions of money and supplies for them. Every town and province had its dual set of officers, those elected under the American laws, and the secret appointees of the Katipunan. Often the elections held under American auspices were controlled by the society and its agents elected to office. Over all floated the American flag, but the real power recognized and feared by the people was the Katipunan.

The oath of the society, sealed with the "pact of blood," required members to keep secrets of the society and to comply blindly with its laws. The laws punished with death those who failed to obey the orders of the chiefs or to give warning if the society were endangered, or those who should betray any of its secrets, or who declined to execute a punishment ordered. These were no idle threats, nor dead letter laws. The society was brotherly and benignant toward those who complied with its rules, but inexorable toward offenders, and halted not at the means of punishment. They spared neither sex nor age. Men who aided the Americans were murdered. Three native policemen of Laoag, for accepting such positions, were enticed to an adjoining town, bound hand and foot, dropped head foremost into a well and buried alive. Three women and an old man, falsely accused of being American spies, were cut to pieces with bolos, and buried still alive in an old well. A prominent Ilocano, accused of being friendly to the Americans, and eight of his companions, were shot near Puncan. A man of Taytay, accused

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of "going to be an American spy," and his companion, were placed bound and kneeling beside their open grave, knocked into it with a bar of iron, and buried alive, one on top of the other as they fell. Five more were murdered in the same town for suspected friendliness to the Americans. That the people might see the results of disobedience, these murders were not infrequently committed in open day before numerous witnesses. Sometimes, tortures were added to make the lesson more impressive. This list of murders may be almost indefinitely multiplied. Friendly natives were slain by hundreds, perhaps thousands: no town probably but had its list of murders by the Katipunan. Usually, their work was done at night; the hidden arms were brought forth, and an armed band would seize its victim and execute the punishment. The natives dreaded the secret, swift and sure retribution which overtook those who expressed sympathy with the American cause, or were merely suspected of such sympathy. On every side flowed the blood of Katipunan victims; the natives, terror-stricken, huddled in the towns, but even there, under the very eyes of the military authorities, the vengeance of the society would seek out and follow those who had been marked for "punishment." Not only offenders against the society were amenable, but its "justice" threatened their families, parents, brothers, sisters and children. It was a reign of blood and terror.

It is difficult for one accustomed to the conditions which obtain in civilized America to understand how a people could allow themselves to be so dominated by such a society; how such a society, whose existence was manifest to outsiders only by murders, extortions, and robberies, could continue to exist.

Even in the United States, it is true, a secret organization may for a time terrorize the people. Many will recall the effect of the Ku-Klux Klan upon the negroes of the South; the terror spread by the Molly Maguires in Pennsylvania, or by the Mafia in Louisiana. These were harmless and innocent organizations compared with the Philippine society. The victims of the Katipunan have been exclusively natives; it has not sought to resist our military forces; it has not fought, nor have its members attempted or desired to fight at any risk to themselves. American military operations have been mostly confined to long tramps in search of an elusive foe hidden in mountain or forest, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protected by a people afraid to give the slightest information concerning him.

An ignorant people, the Filipinos have been governed by soldiers or friars through their fears or their superstitions. A government of law is unknown to them. They obey those they fear most, and they know no other law. In each town were the military chief and the friar; under these were the municipal captains, and the head men or *"principalia."* To these the people rendered blind, unquestioning obedience. Neither man nor woman would marry, engage in service, or do any act out of the ordinary, without consulting and obtaining the consent of the head men. The laborers of a proprietor, often hundreds in number, were his obedient slaves. In some parts of the Islands, a tangible ground of opposition to the American sovereignty was that proprietors would lose their hold on their peons.*

The great majority of the people, the ordinary *"hombres,"* are but slightly removed from savagery. They are traditional liars; they lie freely and fluently whenever their interests or fears are involved, and usually when they are ignorant of the questioner's motives.† They are densely, almost inconceivably, ignorant. Felipe Agoncillo placed the number of Filipinos who can read and write at sixty-three per cent. of the population. It is possible that these figures might apply in Manila. In the provinces they most certainly do not. In a census of two towns, it was found that less than three per cent. could read and write Spanish; less than fourteen per cent. could read and write their own dialect. These towns were both in a Tagal province where opportunities were equal to or above the average. There is no Tagal literature. A few books of plays representing struggles between Christians and Moors have been translated by the friars. A knowledge of Spanish may be taken as a liberal measure of the culture of the people, although many who speak Spanish have never read a book in their lives. Many natives are so ignorant that they do not know their own names, their own ages, or the names of their parents.‡

*The writer knew of a case where for a debt of ten dollars in Mexican money, the man worked for the proprietor some years, and until his death. The man's son took the place of his father, and worked until he died. A daughter grew up to be eight years of age, when the proprietor thought she could be made useful, and called for her services also. Such service is practically for life.

†See "Religión del Katipunan," pp. 12 and 13.

‡"Many persons of both sexes and all classes not only did not know how to read and write, but they were ignorant of their surnames, their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Murder is scarcely regarded as a crime; familiarity with it has bred contempt. A native will frankly confess that he has killed so many men, but will plead that "he was ordered to do it." He will state that he murdered a man hostile to you or to your party solely to ingratiate himself in your favor. He will, with tears in his eyes, kill a member of his own family because ordered by the *Presidente* of the town so to do; he would kill his own child if required to do so by the *Presidente.* Another will squat beside a grave in which his companions are burying alive two of his fellow creatures, hear the muffled cries of the latter as the earth falls upon them growing fainter and fainter as its depth increases, and greedily devour meanwhile a mess of rice rejected by one of the victims of Katipunan "justice."* Such people are little above brutes, but of such is the bulk of the membership of the Katipunan, credulous recipients of its teachings, and mere unthinking instruments for the carrying out of whatever infamy may be directed by the leaders.†

Many of the leaders are ignorant men, scarcely a grade above their followers in intelligence or education, especially the local leaders of towns. Each of these is an irresponsible "chief," with absolute power of life or death, not only over his own members, but over any native upon whom he may see fit to visit the vengeance of the society, or his own. He must likewise execute, or cause to be executed, any order from authority higher than his own.

In every *barrio* are the agents of the society; the people are ever under the watchful eyes of its spies, quick to detect any act of hostility toward themselves, or of friendship toward the Americans. An accusation of either was equivalent to death, for there was no trial and no punishment but death.

It should be easy to imagine the effect of the Katipunan "punishments" on an ignorant and timorous people. For fear of their own lives they dare not refuse to obey Katipunan mandates; under compulsion, many have lent service as soldiers, and have contributed supplies and money to the insurgents; tongue-tied by

ages, the names of their fathers and mothers, and some could not tell their own surnames." Extract from address of Filipino councilman in January, 1901, advocating extension of the public school system.

*All the foregoing and many more are actual cases, of official record, in the Division of the Philippines.

†"From every point of view it is seen that the Katipunan is a terrible association for the very reason that it is composed of plebeian and ignorant people." "Religión del Katipunan," p. 37.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fear, they have not dared to denounce the perpetrators of crimes to the American authorities, for Katipunan vengeance is swift and certain. American justice is slow and tempered with mercy. It is far better to offend the Americans than the Katipunan.

Such has been the effective weapon of the insurgent leaders. By its aid an appearance of general hostility to America has been secured, which in point of fact by no means exists.

It may be granted that, in one sense, the motive of the society is patriotic, in that its stated object is the "liberty of the country"; but such methods cannot result in any real liberty. There are, perhaps, a few disinterested patriots in their ranks, but the leaders surely desire not liberty, but dominion—not freedom, but, for the masses, servitude. They desire not the day when Filipinos shall govern themselves, but that "in which Filipinos shall govern their Philippine children."* The writer has yet to meet a Filipino who understands what liberty is, as we know and understand liberty in America.

The power of the Katipunan is waning. When it falls, the insurrection will be at an end. The active military pursuit of its armed members, the legal trial and punishment of many for brutal murders and other crimes, the liberality of the American Government, which has granted to the Filipinos rights and privileges hitherto unknown to them, the high character of the work of the Philippine Commission, and the natural revolt against so dread an agency as the Katipunan, have all had effect in bringing thinking Filipinos to the American side.

In spite of encouragement from misguided American allies, and ill-considered resolutions of sympathy by the Legislatures of some American states, the inevitable result cannot long be postponed, and the bloody work of the Katipunan is nearing its end. When its dark shadow shall have passed from the land, the people may learn, in the sunlight of real freedom, that a government of law is liberty, and may fit themselves for the transfer of power, even now begun, from potentate to people.

L. W. V. KENNON.

*Address of Emilio Aguinaldo, Cavite Viejo, August 3d, 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORMER ENGLISH INFLUENCE IN GERMANY.

BY SIDNEY WHITMAN.

THE influence of England and English ideas has been a potent factor in Germany. Indeed, it were impossible within the space at my disposal to give more than a short summary, a bare reference to certain names and phases of thought, many of which might well, each by itself, form the theme of a separate work devoted to the subject.

The rise of the German Empire and its self-assertive, though strictly peaceful, character, have somewhat dimmed the memory of those times in which foreign, and particularly English, political influence was very powerful in that country. England and English policy played a great part in the affairs of Germany during the eighteenth and well into the nineteenth century. England allied herself with Prussia during the Seven Years' War, in which the Landgrave of Hesse also took a share, not as an independent German potentate, but as the ally of England. In fact, so heavy was the hand of England in German affairs that the death of George the Second, and the consequent desertion of Frederick the Great by England, brought that monarch to the verge of ruin. From this he was only saved by the simultaneous change of Russia, till then his most powerful enemy, into a friend, in consequence of the death of the Empress Elizabeth and the accession to the Russian throne of Frederick's great admirer, the Emperor Peter the Third.

Few people realize to-day that, during a period of one hundred and twenty-three years (1714-1837), a good slice of North Germany—part of Prussia to-day—was, by virtue of the personal union of the Electorate of Hanover with the English Crown, as much a *dépendance* of Great Britain as any Swiss villa is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dépendance of the principal hotel of the place. The business manager, as well as the proprietor, resided in the larger centre—London. In those days, the Hanoverian Ambassador in London was practically the ruler of a German sovereign principality. The interests of Hanover were naturally subordinated to those of Great Britain, whose wars and general policy became in due course those of her Continental dependency. That this state of things was sometimes fraught with inconvenient consequences to British home interests, and that the Hanoverian incubus was more often cursed than blessed in Parliament and Palace, may readily be believed. On the other hand, there can be no doubt about the ruinous results of this personal union to the Hanoverians themselves. Witness the disastrous campaign in the Netherlands (Battle of Hastenbeck, 1757), the ignominous Convention of Kloster Zeven; and, later on, during the Napoleonic War, the invasion of Hanover, French occupation, extortionate contributions—ending with the incorporation of the Electorate into Napoleon's creation, the Kingdom of Westphalia. However, even here it is only fair to assume that, had Hanover been totally disconnected with the British Crown, forming a purely German sovereign part of the shadowy German Empire, her lot would in all probability have been hardly more enviable. On the other hand, there was a certain sentimental satisfaction in belonging to a World-Empire, the victorious sway of which, during the reign of George the Second, embraced in the East the almost mythical plains of India, and in the West reached from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Virginia and the Mississippi.

But the political ascendancy of England on the Continent is seen in its most potent form during the closing scenes of the European coalition against the First Napoleon. At the Congress of Vienna, England and Russia had the last word in the division of the spoil of the victors. Owing to the dominant position of England, the fact that a large majority of the troops engaged, under Wellington, in the decisive battle of Waterloo, were not English, did not attract attention, and in course of time has entirely lapsed out of the memory of after generations.

In 1815, the English Prince Regent, in addition to being lord of Hanover, as guardian of the young Duke of Brunswick, whose father fell at Quatre-Bras, was virtual ruler of the Duchy of Brunswick as well. Nor must it be supposed that this dominant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position of England was resented as an intrusion; rather the contrary. Hitherto, the different, conflicting German interests had eagerly sought English support of their rival pretensions. And if such a state of things was not resented in days when poets still asked in vain whether there was such a thing as a German Fatherland, it is easy to understand that English statesmen, as well as the English people at large, were long accustomed to look upon Germany as little better than a big allied Protectorate, in which England had a dominating voice. No wonder that they found some difficulty in relinquishing this conception when, later on, German unity came to alter the dependent conditions of the past.

And if Germany to-day resents the slightest sign of English influence upon her political action, as an encroachment savoring of past tutelage, it is only fair to bear in mind that English statesmen have a record of tradition to look back upon which extends over a period four times longer than the existence of the present German Empire, and that during the whole of that time England was a *bona fide* and most influential German power. Also, in Germany itself, and notably in Hanover, there has always been a strong Anglophile party down to our own days. Even up to the year 1866, the officers' mess of a crack Hanoverian cavalry regiment, which shall be nameless, was proud of its affinity to similar bodies in England, and looked down with disdain upon the Spartan but dignified conditions of life which were customary in the Prussian service.

But England has exercised a further influence in Germany of a more subtle and lasting kind than that wielded in camp or cabinet. Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood first established physiology on a scientific basis in Germany. Sir Isaac Newton supplied the mathematical definition of the power which governs the relation of the celestial bodies, as laid down by Copernicus and Keppler. As the discoverer of the law of gravitation, he stood alone. The adverse decision of the English Royal Society on the claims of Leibnitz to priority over Newton in connection with the discovery of the differential calculus, embittered the last days of the German scientist's life.

The influence of the English Deists upon Rationalism in Germany is one of the most striking features of intellectual development in Europe during the eighteenth century. The conten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of Hobbes, that the Church should have no share in shaping the political world, stiffened the backs of those Germans who were eager for emancipation from every form of clerical tutelage in the state. He, as well as John Locke, remained one of the most notable pillars of German empiric thought throughout *das Zeitalter der deutschen Aufklärung.*

About the time (1776-84) in which a German prince, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel—to his everlasting shame—was selling 22,000 of his subjects to England, to fight her battles in America, for a cash payment of 21,276,778 thalers* (over three million pounds, sterling), the Prussian Government was paying the travelling expenses of eager German students to go to Königsberg to hear Immanuel Kant discourse, *inter alia,* upon Newton, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Berkeley, and other eminent Englishmen.

The German University *cathedrae*—not only that of Königsberg—were deeply imbued with English thought, whilst almost all the German Courts, that of Frederick the Great included, were French in thought and diction, and the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel was engaged in the nefarious cash transaction above referred to. England long remained to intellectual Germany much what Protestant Switzerland was to France, before the Revolution—a source of mental stimulation and instruction. Compared to this far-reaching English influence in Germany (and philosophy was but the concentrated, abstract form of far more widely distributed agencies), no foreign intellectual force of any kind, or of all kinds combined, has, ever since the Reformation, attained a similar footing in England. It is, possibly, this partiality for English thought which earned for Germany the doubtful distinction of being looked upon as the land of idealists and dreamers.

The extraordinary importance attached in Germany to English speculative thought is best exemplified by the fact that the works of the foremost English thinkers were translated and published in various centres of Germany during the whole of the eighteenth century.† Some of them before that period, such as

*After the battle of Jena, the then Elector of Hesse-Cassel, obliged to leave his country, intrusted the management of this large sum of money, which he had inherited from his father, to the care of the founder of the house of Rothschild in Frankfort-on-the-Main. When he came back in 1813, he made Rothschild a present of the interest which had accrued in the interval. Thus, a portion of this ill-gotten gain eventually found its way back to England, as part of the fortune of the Rothschild family.

†The relative significance of this wide permeation of English philosophic thought in Germany during the eighteenth century may be, perhaps, better understood when we remember that no complete uniform edition of Herbert

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More, Hobbes, Locke and Newton, were current in the Latin tongue. For instance, over twenty distinct editions in Latin and German of Sir Thomas More's "Utopia" have been printed in different parts of Germany between 1518 and the present day. And, if translation was so general, it will readily be understood that German comment on English thought must have been voluminous and widespread in due proportion.

The universal appreciation of Shakespeare in Germany may be summed up in the words of Paul de St. Victor: *"L'Allemagne est Shakespearisée: pour employer un barbarisme de Emerson, 'Il l'a reflaite à son image.'"** The German treatises dealing with Shakespeare may be counted by the thousand. The study of his plays is as much a part of general education as that of any German playwriter; and passages from them are quoted in conversation by the educated with the familiarity due to a home classic.

By far the greater number of Shakespeare's works belong to the regular repertory of every German theatre of any standing. His bust or portrait or emblazoned name is to be seen wherever decorative work or monuments in connection with the Drama are to be met with. In other words, Shakespeare is one of the heroes of the Teuton world.

Translations of Milton's "Paradise Lost" were published in Zurich in 1732, in Brunswick in 1793, and again in 1823. Oliver Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield" appeared in Leipzig in 1776; Fielding's "Tom Jones" in 1786. Laurence Sterne's "Tristram Shandy" is cited by German writers in the latter part of the last century, as familiarly as we are accustomed to cite Horace. One of the most extraordinary instances of British literary influence in Germany is supplied by Macpherson's "Songs of Ossian." Not only did Herder and Goethe try their hand at its translation, but separate and distinct German translations of the book appeared in 1768, 1775, 1782, 1801, 1806 and 1808.

Coming nearer to our own time, we find a widespread familiarity with Byron, Keats and Shelley, Sir Walter Scott, Bulwer, and lastly Charles Dickens—some of whose books have become classics in Germany. The outbreak of the Franco-German War found Count Moltke deep in the study of "David Copperfield."

Spencer's works exists in England. A German friend of mine, whose wife recently wished to present such an edition to him, was obliged to order it from America.

*Les Deux Masques, Vol. III. Paul de St. Victor, Paris.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The poetical works of Shakespeare or Byron still attract the attention of German translators to-day. To cite some of the most recent instances: Herr Otto Gildemeister, a well-known German Shakespearian scholar and for many years a senator of the town of Bremen, has published a German translation of Byron's complete works, as well as a German rendering of Shakespeare's Sonnets. The late Friedrich Bodenstaedt, whose own original poetical works have passed through innumerable editions, also translated Shakespeare's Sonnets and a number of his plays. Shelley is still the theme of enthusiastic German biographers and translators at the present time.

But infinitely more interesting than the mere enumeration of the names of English authors who have been translated and read by millions of German readers during the last two centuries, is the influence which some of their writings have exercised over the greatest of German poets and dramatists. No nation and no period in the world's history has produced a group of men of such broad cosmopolitan and humanistic sympathies as Germany possessed in Herder, Lessing, Schiller and Goethe. These men were entirely free from national envy and bias. The plot of Lessing's first dramatic essay—the tragedy of Miss Sara Sampson—was drawn from an English source. The charming story of Goethe's courtship of Fredericke Brion is interspersed by frequent references to the "Vicar of Wakefield." His veneration for Shakespeare may be summed up in his own words, that the contemplation of the greatness of the English bard was enough to discourage him from any attempt to do original work of his own. Goethe's familiarity with and partiality for Byron and Sir Walter Scott is well known. Schiller, the greatest dramatic genius Germany has produced, translated "Macbeth" into German; also two of his own original dramatic works, "The Maid of Orleans" and "Maria Stuart," are taken from English history. German dramatists, down to the present time, have taken their subjects from English history and English life in many instances. This was before the present Emperor had bestowed his patronage on dramatic works dealing exclusively with the history and glorification of the House of Hohenzollern.

To turn to a wider survey, the Peace of 1815, as already indicated, had left England as an exceedingly influential, *bona fide* German power. The extraordinary success of Great Britain, both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a colonial and naval power, her military prowess in Spain and finally at Waterloo, had lit up a halo round the very name of England in the mind of Germany, which had only just issued from the agony of a Napoleonic nightmare prolonged through an entire generation. If we add to the situation the traditions inherited from previous generations of British ascendancy in philosophy, science, and particularly in literature, it is scarcely surprising to learn that the English had come to be regarded by many people in Germany with feelings of exceptional deference. Hard-headed old Schopenhauer, notwithstanding his intense dislike for some English institutions, notably the English Church, was much impressed by the individual Englishman—the fellow-countryman of Locke and Hobbes, both of whom he devoutly venerated. Schopenhauer's North German, practical spirit also enabled him to appreciate the commercial, the money-getting, aptitude of England. If I am not greatly mistaken, the great pessimist philosopher once expressed himself to the effect that, if he had had his choice, he would have preferred to have been born an Englishman. Many Germans of less eminence and strong individuality were highly flattered if they were mistaken for Englishmen when travelling. This flattering *méprise* once occurred to Prince Bismarck, as he himself related to me. As a young man he was travelling in a French diligence on the northern road from Paris to Holland, and sat beside the driver. The latter suddenly apostrophised him thus: *"Il y a diablement de vos compatriotes en France à présent."*

"Comment donc, mes compatriotes?" replied Bismarck.

"Mais oui," rejoined the other. *"Vous êtes donc Anglais?"*

The sea-borne commerce of the world was nearly a monopoly in English hands; the seaport towns of North Germany—Lubeck, Bremen, Hamburg and Danzig—were principally visited by English ships, bringing the produce of England's colonies, as well as endless stores of high-priced, but invariably excellent, English home manufactures to German shores. In these German seaport towns more especially, all things English, no less than Englishmen individually, were eagerly welcomed and regarded as types of excellence. The era of the "cheap and nasty" had scarcely dawned. In other words, the recognition of England was a tribute paid to exceptional capacity and a high standard of character.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The English aristocracy, after having been cut off from personal contact with the Continent of Europe for the best part of a generation, made the grand tour in their luxurious carriages, the like of which were only to be found in the stables of royal personages in Germany. They were received with distinction at the different German Courts, where even the more middle-class element—the less imposing captain in the militia, for instance—was readily accepted as first cousin to an English peer. But, one and all, they created an impression of English affluence, were it only by the elaborate cut of their clothes, representative of the doubtful dignity of Wealth, wherever they passed through a country which was still plunged in poverty. It is probable that the German tradition of *"der reiche Engländer"*—one of whom is popularly represented to have killed a waiter and asked the host to put him down in the bill—owed its origin to those days when wealthy Englishmen scoured the Continent in search of pleasure and the excitement of travel.

However, the prestige of England in Germany was not to rest for long upon the glamour of wealth or the renown of past successful achievement, which is so often the case in connection with national reputation or so-called *prestige*. The supremacy of England was shortly to be brought home to the German nation in a manner even more striking than before by her prowess in arms, in diplomacy, in the Senate, in literature, science and abstract thought. English parliamentary institutions were tacitly accepted as models to be recognized as supreme, and devoutly to be envied, if not worshipped. The forensic efforts of a Pitt or a Fox excited unbounded admiration among the educated in Germany. English art, strange to say, although it had attained its highest development in Reynolds and Gainsborough, was unknown. Adam Smith's great work, "The Wealth of Nations," had already attracted the attention of the thinker; it had long been known that James Watt had solved the problem of utilizing steam power in manufacture—Stephenson had constructed his first locomotive in the year 1812. But it was only gradually that the practical results of all this epoch-making mass of British energy and ingenuity came home to the German nation at large, and impressed them even more with the all-round superiority of the Englishman. The triumph of English individualism, from the field of pure scientific research to that of practical mechanics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

engineering, etc., was complete. It produced an awe-inspiring effect—on a nation which even to-day bows down, sometimes extravagantly, to the academically trained and officially hall-marked doctor, professor and privy councillor—to witness the solution of great problems, in many instances by comparatively uneducated Englishmen who had risen from the humblest walks of life, which had baffled the learned of past generations in all Europe.

In order to understand the vast nature of English intellectual position and influence in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century, we need only glance again at the diversity of its character, and the number of channels through which, by means of the high state of efficiency and honesty of national education in Germany, it permeated the whole country through the twenty German Universities, the various scientific polytechnica, as well as the thousands of schools of the Fatherland. In almost every branch of human thought and effort, we find English names pre-eminent and impartially put before the German student and pupil in that light. To mention only the greatest: in physiology, Harvey and Jenner*; in physics, Newton, Faraday and Sir Humphry Davy; in philosophy, Locke, Hobbes, Hume and many others; in literature, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron, Sir Walter Scott; in political economy, Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Mill; in mechanics, Watt and Stephenson. Surely, never in history has the youth of a nation been systematically trained to recognize with unstinted admiration so vast an embodiment of foreign excellence as an incentive to emulation. Nor has the world, perhaps, ever witnessed so widespread a movement, free from depreciating envy, in the honest pursuit of the highest standards of truth and human knowledge, regardless of the country from which they came. For it must be borne in mind that, although England was admittedly foremost, due recognition of the pioneers of thought in other countries has never been neglected in the German scholastic curriculum. But Germany had not yet become a political nation to the extent that national bias warps the vision to foreign excellence and degenerates into national conceit.

* The old story of the prophet and the difficulty of his acceptance in his own country is aptly illustrated in the case of Jenner, whose discovery of vaccination was hailed with enthusiasm in Germany. When he told a friend that he proposed to place the results of his experiments in vaccination before the Royal Society, the latter dissuaded him, and begged him not to jeopardize the reputation he had already gained by his great work on the cuckoo.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The effect of this general distribution of knowledge concerning the great part which England and Englishmen were playing in every walk of life, did not stop short at the threshold of school or college. The German nobility, engaged in agriculture, the career of arms and the service of the state in general, it is true, took comparatively little heed of England's great scientific and industrial progress. The aristocratic land owners on the shores of the Baltic and the German Ocean were well content to ship their produce to England at remunerative prices; and, at most, English political history and literature found diligent students among them. Thus we see Helmuth von Moltke, as a young officer, endeavoring to earn a little pocket money by the translation of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." On a summer day, young Bismarck could be seen basking in the sun at Schoenhausen reading "Hamlet." But, among the German middle classes, the desire became general to study and visit a country in which so much energy was successfully devoted to commerce and industry. Germans in every walk of life came to England with a desire to learn practical lessons from what they saw; and it is on record that there was much to see and to learn from factories, breweries, shipping yards, which were found to exist in England on a scale entirely unknown on the Continent. For, during the time in which the Germans had been engaged in war—that is, during the best part of the eighteenth century—England had shot ahead, and an entirely new class of people had come into being—the class of the great manufacturers. Germany's manufactures were still in the primitive stage of petty, so-called house industry, whereas England had already a century of industrial production on a large scale to her credit. This advantage was, naturally, visible everywhere and in everything. English railways, engineering enterprise, as well as post-office organization, were in a far more advanced and efficient state in those days than elsewhere. German visitors saw and noted all this. In fact, there can be no doubt that this close study of industrial England, as well as the emulation which it called forth, were powerful incentives toward the later developments of German production. The close study of English methods had also another and scarcely sufficiently known result, and this was its influence on German political thought and its share in the formation of the German Liberal party. The English were ahead of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Germans in everything. English individualism—reflected in politics as well as elsewhere—was the subject of general admiration. English methods were the only ones which could possibly show Germany the way to success. In politics, this admiration of English methods in due course produced a school of Patent-Medicine men—eager for blind imitation; whereas, in every other domain, the study of English effort stimulated to excel and has tended toward emulation and improvement. England has been the source of inspiration, the parent of much German original work in our time.

The year 1848, with its political upheavals all over Europe, only tended to throw into yet stronger relief the generally accepted superiority of English methods—notably the political stability of the English institution of constitutional monarchy and parliamentary government, which the liberal elements of half Europe vociferously demanded for themselves. German princes were obliged to capitulate to the mob or fly for their lives. The Continent was ablaze with revolution, at the very time when Queen Victoria was being cheered to the echo by an enthusiastic crowd in front of Buckingham Palace. It was on such an occasion that Prince William of Prussia—afterward German Emperor, but at that time a vilified refugee from his own country—stood by the side of the Queen. Although unable to forget his own deplorable position, he heartily congratulated her on this outburst of loyalty. And it is said that Her Majesty, in her endeavor to console her guest, prophetically replied that he too would live to be acclaimed some day in a similar manner by the German people.

This scene may well mark the apogee of England's ascendancy over Germany. It marks, too, the lowest ebb in the story of Germany's political humiliation. SIDNEY WHITMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIMPLE LOGIC OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

BY W. D. McCRACKAN, OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

"At that time Jesus answered and said; I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

Matt. xi., 25.

THE writer of an article on Christian Science in the July number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, after describing certain qualifications which he possesses for writing upon the subject, adds the following words:

"If, therefore, I am without some measure of understanding of the personal equation and of the theory and practice of Christian Science, want of opportunity cannot be pleaded in my defense, should injustice be done here in the treatment of the founder and the foundations and what has been built thereon."

Christian Scientists have been accustomed, for several years past, to see the signature of this writer affixed to various articles about Christian Science. They have not attributed the injustice which he has done to the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science and to Christian Science itself, in those articles, to "want of opportunity" on his part; but they have been conscious that he has always approached the subject in a purely critical vein, and that for this reason he has always missed the real significance of Christian Science, and has constantly remained "without some measure of understanding" of his subject. While he has written a great deal *about* Christian Science, he has never been able to write of Christian Science itself.

The door of spiritual understanding will open only to those who knock, and they who are not thirsty cannot drink. If the learned writer sees an "absurd paradox" in Christian Science, it is because he has attempted to understand a spiritual truth through the so-called wisdom of this world. Paul warned the Corinthians against this mistake when he wrote:

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

But it is not only the manner of the writer's approach which militates against his ability to treat of Christian Science. He has not demonstrated the Science which he attempts to criticise. He has never practised Christian Science. He cannot reform the sinner or heal the sick through Christian Science. From this standpoint, many a Christian Science child, which has learned to use its slight understanding of God, in order to heal its own bruises, or those of its playmates, is better fitted to speak of Christian Science with authority than this learned theologian. At the age of twelve, the young boy Jesus was so far advanced that he astonished the doctors in the temple.

When the writer in the July number has obtained more than a merely theoretical knowledge of Christian Science, so that he can reform the sinner and heal the sick by its methods, then I have no doubt he will be glad to write another article setting forth its marvellous results. These words are not, in any sense, intended to question the sincerity of the writer of the July article. On the contrary, no one could have pursued the subject for years, as he has, without being moved by a distinct purpose. The lack of a proper understanding of the subject is all that is charged against him, due to his purely critical attitude and to his want of practical experience. And because his spirit of sincerity is not questioned, I will take pains, later in this article, to point out in detail wherein the distinguished theologian has done an injustice to his subject, both in his quotations from the Bible and from "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," as well as in the deductions which he has drawn from these quotations.

For the present, I beg to set over against the concept of an "absurd paradox," which he professes to see in Christian Science, the statement that Christian Science is deduced by simple logic from a proper comprehension of the nature of God and man, as revealed in the Scriptures. Step by step the conclusions unravel themselves, inevitably and securely, from established premises. The following is a portion of the excellent definition of Christian Science contained in the Standard Dictionary:

"Christian Science is based on the teachings of Scripture, which it interprets, giving the Christ principle and rule, in Divine metaphysics, which heals the sick and sinner. It explains all cause and effect as mental, and shows the scientific relation of man to God."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All men have deeply implanted in their nature a faith in some first Cause, or some controlling Power. This is what the deist calls God. Now, it has been the misfortune of many orthodox Christian denominations that they have allowed an illogical concept of this God to survive among them. God has been represented as Infinite, Ever-present and Perfect, and yet subject to limitations of outline and form, and in some cases He has even been made capable of anger and hate. In other words, a man-made God has been manufactured to satisfy a limited, human concept. But when all is said and done, what definition of God will alone satisfy the demands of Infinity, Ever-presence and Perfection? Is there any concept except that of Spirit, or Mind, which fulfills these requirements?

Christian Science, then, teaches that God is Spirit, or Mind. But if God is infinite and perfect, He must also be Infinite Good, and this Infinite Good is what we term Love. The idea of a God knowing good and evil, capable of love and hate, rewarding and punishing His children at will, gives place in Christian Science to a new concept. "God is divine Principle, supreme incorporeal Being, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, Love."*

If God is Spirit, and He made man in His image and likeness, then man must be spiritual, and must reflect God's nature, as the creature reflects the Creator. Everything, therefore, which seems unlike God, or Good, in man must be the result of some false belief, and cannot form a part of the real and indestructible Creation.

The teachings of Christian Science concerning matter and its discordant manifestations in disease are easily distorted by careless critics. Even sincere searchers may misinterpret them unintentionally. Christian Scientists in their attitude towards matter keep abreast of the foremost natural scientists of the day, who have declared that matter can no longer be defined satisfactorily except in terms of mind.

Professor Huxley writes:

"After all, what do we know of this terrible matter except as the name for the unknown hypothetical cause of states of our own consciousness."

Grant Allen, the well-known author, in the course of an article on the late Professor Tyndall, thus speaks of matter:

*"Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," by Mary Baker G. Eddy, page 461.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The charge of materialism could only be brought against such a man by those abject materialists who have never had a glimpse of the profounder fact, that the universe, as known to us, consists wholly of Mind, and that matter is a doubtful and uncertain inference of the human intelligence."

Professor Wilhelm Müller, the German scientist, said in a recent article:

"The study of chemical combinations led to the establishment of the atomistic theory. The latter is, undoubtedly, ingenious and apparently perfectly logical, but, if we follow it out in its consequences, we soon find ourselves in a dilemma. If the atom is indivisible, it cannot occupy any space, for everything that fills space, no matter how small, can be thought divisible, and must be divisible *ad infinitum*. But, on the other hand, if the atom is really indivisible and does, therefore, occupy no space, it can never be a part, however small, of matter. 0 plus 0 plus 0 plus 0 . . . to infinity would always be equal to 0. The total is equal to the sum of its components. Inasmuch as the total, in this case matter, occupies space, that equality must essentially pertain to every part, however small, of the whole. The logical deduction would be that matter is composed of parts which are not matter, a theory which is obviously unsound."

The view which Christian Scientists take of disease may well be illustrated by the relation which darkness holds to light, or black to the various colors. Darkness is not an entity or a reality, but merely the absence of light; black is not a color, but rather the negation of all color. So disease is viewed in Christian Science as the absence or negation of health, and not as a positive quantity. This is far from calling disease imaginary, for it is just as real as any negation can be. Humanly speaking, disease is distressingly real while it lasts; but when it is entirely gone, destroyed, by whatever means, where is its reality? It might be termed, paradoxically, a temporary reality; but, in point of fact, the real is the eternal and indestructible, and disease certainly does not belong to such a category.

Viewed merely as a therapeutic agent, Christian Science goes one step beyond homeopathy. The latter, in its high potency phase, administers medicine, in which the drug can no longer be detected, even by the subtlest chemical test. As a foremost homeopathic physician once said of such medicines: "There is nothing left but mind."

Now, Christian Science heals by an understanding of Mind—not of the human mind, which modern psychologists have laid bare with such pitiless perseverance—but of the One Mind, or Spirit, which is God. The results are truly marvellous. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is hardly a known disease which has not yielded to the blessed realization which comes from knowing God, even a little. Herein lies the justification for the title of Christian Science, that it is Christian because it explains the life and works of Christ; and it is scientific, because it produces definite, ascertainable results; and those who attempt to prevent the sick, who cannot find help in any material remedy, from coming to Christian Science are taking a very great responsibility upon themselves.

There is no "absurd paradox" in Christian Science. It starts with Spirit; it holds to Spirit, and ends with Spirit. God and man and the universe are thereby linked together in a logical chain of reasoning. An "absurd paradox," however, does appear in the views concerning God and man and the universe, of which the writer of the July article is a representative. How is it possible to understand logically a God who is Infinite, and yet admits the presence of His opposite, evil? For the term Infinite means All, and there can be nothing more than All. If God is Infinite, and is harmonious, how is it possible to admit the presence of discord, or disease?

The writer of the July article, instead of placing the concept of an "absurd paradox" upon Christian Science, must first explain the "absurd paradox" in his own views. He cannot do this. There is no way out of the dilemma in which he finds himself, except through a realization of the essential unreality of evil and of disease, as taught in Christian Science. Either God knows and permits evil, in which case He cannot be Infinite Good; or He knows no evil, and every concept which falls under that head must be outside of His creation. But God created all things; therefore, if evil exists, God, Infinite Good, must have created it. Is the writer of the July number willing to hold God responsible for all the evil, disease, suffering and crime to which mortals believe themselves to be subject?

Christian Science offers the only logical explanation of the nature of evil which the world has had presented to it since the days of Jesus and his disciples. It uncovers the mystery of evil. Evil is not part of God's Creation. It is illusion and delusion—nothingness—outlawed by common sense. It is a lie, to be branded as such. It is no more real than the horizon line on the sea, which seems to be and is not, and which a traveller might pursue around the earth forever, and never find.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This brief exposition of the logical structure of Christian Science, though inadequate as an explanation of its teachings, will suffice to prepare the reader to see wherein the criticisms of the writer of the July article lack foundation.

Some of the writer's remarks seem to be directed against supposed assertions which are not stated. For instance, it is not clear what authority the writer has for saying that the verse on the fly leaf of "Science and Health" is a "characterization of the Infinite Ego;" no such explanation accompanies the text, but even if this interpretation be correct, he does not tell us what conclusions he draws therefrom.

A quotation from Mrs. Eddy's writings, which he designates as drawn from "elsewhere," is an incorrect rendering from "Miscellaneous Writings," pp. 361-2. Here the word "elucidates" has been changed to "eliminates"—totally changing the sense of Mrs. Eddy's words. Owing to a certain similarity in the appearance of these printed words, and to the fact that they contain the same number of letters, I think this mistake must be ascribed to a typographical error.

The statement that "Mrs. Eddy acts as if she had no peculiar theory of God, man and the universe," is true, in the sense that her theory is as old as Christianity, and her actions are in conformity therewith.

The writer's references to certain souvenir spoons and the supposed "profits" derived from them is on a par with some of the more gossipy insinuations which he has allowed himself to retail in times past. The actual facts concerning these souvenir spoons have been repeatedly stated in the press, and it is to be hoped that the learned divine has now written his last references to them. Upon the request of a citizen of Concord, N. H., and for his benefit solely, Mrs. Eddy gave permission to have her head engraved upon some souvenir spoons. She even recommended her students to buy them, in order to assist the citizen in question, but she herself has never received a cent from the sale of them.

In quoting from page 31 of Mrs. Eddy's work, entitled "No and Yes," the writer of the July article makes an entirely unwarranted insertion of his own into the body of the text, which is calculated to prejudice and deceive the minds of readers. He introduces the name of "Science and Health" after "the Word of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Truth," in such a way as to give the impression that Mrs. Eddy considers these two expressions synonymous. It is evident to any sincere student of Mrs. Eddy's works that she considers the Scriptures to be the Word of Truth, and "Science and Health" merely a "Key to the Scriptures," as its full title indicates.

The critic expresses his inability to understand that matter cannot suffer in and of itself, and yet it is easy to show that all sensation is mental. Surely, no one claims that inorganic matter suffers; then why believe that so-called organic matter does? What is it which distinguishes organic from inorganic matter, except the presence of mind in the first, and its absence in the second? It follows, then, that it is mind, the human, mortal mind, which suffers, and not matter at all; and this mortal mind is not "a species of trick," as the critic implies, but is the same as the carnal mind, spoken of by St. Paul, when he wrote:

"The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

The five physical senses all have a mental origin, according to the testimony of the natural scientists themselves. There is nothing more puzzling to investigators in the whole field of research than the process by which man sees, hears, touches, tastes and smells. The investigator can examine the material mechanisms which seem to perform these functions; he can trace the optic nerves, auditory nerves, olfactory nerves, and the nerves that seem to feel and taste, on their way to the brain; and, just as he thinks he has solved the riddle, he finds himself face to face with an imponderable, immaterial something, which defies his material instruments, something which he calls mind. It baffles his own five physical senses, and yet he knows that it is in control of matter. He locates this mind in the brain. So popular belief places the soul in the organ called the heart; although the Chinese, who wrote treatises on the soul before our ancestors knew how to read and write, place the soul in the liver.

When rightly understood, "Science and Health" agrees with and interprets the Bible, and thus proves to be a veritable "Key to the Scriptures." It has been singularly successful in this task. The heart of the critic would rejoice if he could talk personally with many of the men and women who have become enthusiastic and regular Bible readers through the study of "Science and Health;" they are people who had once searched the Scriptures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in vain for an explanation of the problem of Being, or were indifferent to the Word of God, or even directly hostile to it.

Speaking before the Episcopal Congress in Providence last November, the Rev. E. Winchester Donald, successor to Phillips Brooks as rector of Trinity Church in Boston, said:

"Is Christian Science leading men out of the darkness of unbelief into the light of God? Yes, it is, it is; there can be no doubt about that. You and I know too many Christian Scientists whose lives are blameless, to doubt that."

More recently still, the Rev. Percy S. Grant, rector of the Church of the Ascension in New York, wrote:

"I wish every church member were as spiritually alive, and willing to sacrifice as much for their principles and for their soul development, as are many of the Christian Scientists I know of. It is spiritual life. Every church member ought to practise Christian Science. The more Christian Scientists that I can have in my church, the better I shall like it. When I meet a Christian Scientist, I find a person who is religiously alive and striving after spiritual advancement."

The critic's numerous quotations from the Old Testament, to show that the Hebrews had a system of sanitation and suffered from various diseases, and even his references to medicine, used in a figurative sense, do not carry conviction, for Christian Science is not Judaism, but Christianity. The Master himself never taught sanitation. He healed through Mind, and showed that man was not dependent upon material remedies, and he did this so effectually that he closed the era of fleshly sacrifices for the remission of sins. It was he who said:

"Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on."

Jesus was progressive. He was radical in his teachings. But even taking the events of the Old Testament into consideration, as marking the gradual advance of the Hebrews from materialism to a clearer realization of spirituality, the arguments in favor of healing through Mind instead of matter abound. Many cases of healing without material remedies are recorded from Genesis to Malachi.

Moreover, in place of the writer's enumeration of the mortal, material beliefs of the Hebrews, let me call the attention of the reader to the marvellous prophecy of Isaiah:

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them."

This verse, and the succeeding ones, clearly show that Isaiah

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

looked for a time when the ferocity of wild beasts and the poison of venomous serpents would be proved unreal.

Surely, the writer of the July article, if he interprets the Scriptures in a mere material sense, would not take upon himself the responsibility of giving the advice which he quotes from Proverbs: "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy heart. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more." Many men have followed this advice materially with sad results. But if the word "wine" be used in its spiritual sense of "inspiration," the case is different. Nor can the fact that Jesus uses the words "physician" and "sick" be taken as proving either that he believed in using drugs, or that he acknowledged sickness to be anything more than a false concept of the human mind. He was called the Great Physician, and yet he never used a single drug. On the contrary, his knowledge that sickness was mental is amply proved by his treatment of the man sick of the palsy. He said to him first: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." That was the real healing of the man; then followed the after-effect, the material manifestation of the spiritual regeneration, when Jesus said: "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house."

Paul's prescription to Timothy, of "a little wine for his stomach's sake," seems to have been a concession to material methods, but it was not in conformity with the practice or the advice of Jesus, and here again I question whether the learned divine would repeat the advice. Moreover, what authority has he for affirming that "wherever illness was mentioned by Christ or any of His Apostles, it was spoken of as a reality." Nowhere is this stated explicitly. If illness was a reality then, and is a reality now, and was the work of God, and therefore part of His Creation, what right had Christ or any of His Apostles to destroy it?

When the critic takes exception to the payments made to Christian Scientists for their services, he places himself in a curious position. I have no desire to be in the least personal in refuting his misrepresentations, but the question naturally obtrudes itself as to whether the learned divine would consider it wrong to receive a stipend for his own ministrations? As a matter of fact, both the clergy and the medical profession accept pay-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment for their services, and rightly, too; then why should not Christian Scientists, who combine in a measure the avocations of both? Jesus and the Apostles did not charge a fee, it is true, for that was not in accordance with the custom of the time and country in which they lived. They accepted hospitality, however; they were provided with board and lodging, and Jesus said expressly that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," and enjoined the Apostles not to carry purse or scrip, implying that they were to live from the grateful gifts of those whom they healed physically and mentally. It is not so long since the country schoolmasters of our pioneer States taught without money payments, but were "kept" by the families of the pupils.

Furthermore, no service can be said to be a strictly complete action until it has produced a corresponding sense of gratitude; and this sense will naturally express itself in material things among men, who are still subject to material beliefs. As a matter of practical experience, giving without receiving tends to pauperize the recipient, as all those who have any experience in charity work have long since discovered. No one, therefore, need cavil at the small remuneration given to Christian Scientists for their work. Patients are often helped who pay nothing at all, or only a mere trifle. But, when all is said and done, no adequate money return can ever be made for the glorious spiritual awakening, and the freedom from fleshly ills, which mark the true healing in Christian Science. Such blessings are beyond price, and this is the tenor of the testimonies of all those who have been thus healed.

So, too, when the critic quotes Jesus' command to the seventy, "Heal the sick," another question arises spontaneously, and that is: Why do not all Christians obey this explicit command of Jesus? Jesus' injunction was for all his followers and for all time. If humble Christians who make no claims to great learning are able to heal the physically sick, what excuse can learned divines have for disobeying the Master's command?

According to my comprehension, when Jesus said to his disciples, "Handle me and see, a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," he was not arguing for the reality of matter, but he was rather rebuking them for their belief in spirits or apparitions.

Far from disparaging "faith," or calling it antagonistic to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"understanding," Mrs. Eddy shows conclusively in her writings the necessity for faith as a stepping stone toward a higher understanding. It is mere blind belief, unsustained by any understanding of the Truth, which Mrs. Eddy declares to be insufficient. Moreover, she deprecates petitioning an All-knowing God for special favors. In Christian Science, prayer rises beyond mere asking, into a realm of realization where God's omnipotence and omnipresence are not questioned. The warning of James must not be disregarded: "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss."

It is perfectly true that Christ never suffered on the cross and never died; but Jesus did. Christian Science makes a vital distinction between the man Jesus and his title of the Christ. Mrs. Eddy writes:

"The word *Christ* is not properly a synonym for Jesus, though it is commonly so used. Jesus was a human name, which belonged to him in common with other Hebrew boys and men—for it is identical with the name of Joshua, the renowned Hebrew leader. On the other hand, Christ is not a name so much as a title, and belongs to our Master exclusively. Christ expresses God's spiritual, eternal idea. The name is synonymous with Messiah, and alludes to the spirituality which was taught, illustrated and demonstrated in the Life whereof Christ Jesus was the embodiment. The proper name of our Master, in the Greek, was Jesus the Christ; but Christ Jesus better signifies the God like."*

This distinction has helped many a Christian Scientist to understand the Incarnation and the Resurrection.

It is generally conceded that the cures effected by Christian Science are not always instantaneous; and that many of the surgical cases have been turned over to surgeons. But this does not prove that the cures in Christian Science differ in quality from those performed by Jesus and his disciples. Christian Scientists are only beginners in this wonderful work; they have barely entered upon their demonstrations of the healing power of Mind, and they are still learning their A B C at the feet of the Master. They will accomplish better results later on. It may be of interest to recall, in this connection, the fact that even Jesus was not able to do many mighty works in his own country, "because of their unbelief," and that his healing of the blind man of Bethsaida, as related in Mark 8, 22-27, was not instantaneous, but gradual; for, after Jesus had put his hands upon the man for the first time, the latter only saw dimly, and said, "I see men

*"Science and Health," p. 228.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as trees walking." It was not until Jesus had put his hands again upon his eyes that he "saw every man clearly." Nor is there any Biblical authority for saying, as our critic does, that the disciples "lost no patients," or that "those whom they healed suffered no relapses." There was no record kept of these cases, as far as we know.

Whatever Mrs. Eddy has written concerning the effects of diet and dirt can be readily proved to be correct by actual experience, and the truth of her teachings is being demonstrated daily by hundreds of thousands. It is the beliefs which accompany our eating, drinking and bathing which make these acts beneficial or otherwise to health. Concerning exercise, I find Mrs. Eddy's words wonderfully corroborated in I. Timothy 4, 8, where Paul writes:

> "For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

All of these criticisms, on the part of the writer of the July article, result from a grossly materialistic view of Man. If Man is, indeed, a piece of matter-mechanism, then the critic's objections are valid enough, but when Man is understood to be made in the image and likeness of Spirit, and to be a spiritual or mental being, all seeming opposition to Christian Science vanishes in an understanding of its blessed truth.

As for the accuracy of the testimonies offered by those who have been healed by Christian Science, I need only say that these testimonies depend almost invariably upon the reports of physicians. The patients themselves have no professional knowledge of their own diseases. If, therefore, "the number and diversity of diseases from which those whom they heal were suffering" seem great to the critic, he must recognize from this fact how far-reaching the results of Christian Science have really become.

No person of average intelligence any longer denies that cures are performed by Christian Science. In a recent article, T. J. Hudson, the psychologist, gives it as his opinion that Christian Scientists "have healed the sick by hundreds of thousands," and "have poured the balm of religious consolation into many a stricken heart."

Professor G. T. Ladd, of Yale University, testifies to the same fact in another article. He asks himself the question con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerning Christian Scientists: "Do they not perform cures? Undoubtedly they do."

The use of the word "incantations" is calculated to deceive. Christian Science treatments are no more incantations than are the prayers of any devout Christian. The critic does not state upon what diseases Christian Scientists show the same inability "to exert the least influence" "which Mormons, anti-medicine faith-healers, spiritualists and occult healers of all kinds encounter." Christian Science has already healed virtually every disease known to the medical profession, but if there are any more to be encountered, I have no doubt that Christian Science will overcome them also.

The failures of Christian Scientists are relatively rare. A very high percentage of cures is effected. While the failures of *materia medica* fill the obituary columns of our newspapers, without attracting any attention, a single failure to apply Christian Science successfully is exploited by sensational methods of all kinds. As a matter of fact, the great majority of failures ascribed to Christian Science in the press have no connection whatever with Christian Science itself. Most of them can be traced to the practices of people who are not Christian Scientists, but who do not employ medical aid for various reasons.

The attitude of Christian Scientists toward the medical profession is one of kindliness and appreciation. The physicians are rapidly growing further away from drugs, and are paying increased attention to mental symptoms. Their self-sacrifice and devotion is gratefully recognized.

Those who carelessly criticise Christian Science would find it hard to account for the fact, that more than a million sensible, sober, and successful men and women, all over the world, hold to it in loving devotion. There are no sermons preached in Christian Science Churches to attract crowds, and nobody is obliged to frequent them. If the denomination is growing with amazing rapidity, it is because it gives those who come to it a wonderful return for their faith.

One of the chief merits of Christian Science is the manner in which it clears away the occultism or mysticism which is commonly supposed to pervade spiritual matters. Christian Scientists are not trifling with contagious diseases, but are law-abiding citizens, and the burden of proof lies with those who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assert the contrary, to show where a single person has been infected by carelessness on the part of Christian Scientists. They are as scrupulous toward other people's beliefs, as they would have others be toward their own faith. Health is a thousandfold more contagious than disease, and it is hazarding nothing to say that the many groups of Christian Scientists throughout this country and Europe are centres of a new health-giving influence. For all this, the world is indebted to Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy, and all fair-minded persons rejoice to hear that her comfortable, though moderate, fortune is but the well-earned wage of a hard-working woman.

The writer of the July article has been pursuing for years a false fabrication of his own making, which he has called Christian Science. And while he has been busy with the false, the real Christian Science has been growing to noble proportions at his side, unperceived. It cannot be fully apprehended by the human, mortal mind. Mortal mind is limited by its very nature. It thinks of man only as a mortal, included between birth and death. It can know nothing of an immortal Being—of Spirit. The life of Jesus is foolishness to mortal mind; it understands neither his conception, nor his healing of sin and sickness, nor his conquest over death, nor his resurrection and ascension. But Christian Science, the Science of Christ, proclaims that sin, sickness and death are not real; that righteousness, health and Eternal Life are real; that the Truth is Good, not evil; that it is Light, not darkness; Principle, not accident; Mind, not matter. Whoever relies exclusively upon what is known as the intellectual faculty, which is only another name for mortal mind, will be disappointed and deceived. Pride of intellect is often a stumbling block. We must become like little children, as single-minded, open-minded, and pure-minded as they, and as trustful of our Heavenly Father as they.

History repeats itself. We read of Jesus that "the common people heard him gladly." To-day the common people, those who are not weighed down with the pride of profession or of place, are once more listening gladly to his Gospel, to Christian Science, which is the Science of his life and teachings.

Jesus said: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

W. D. McCRACKAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIFE IN THE SEA.

BY CHARLES MINOR BLACKFORD, JR., M. D.

SHOULD some observant savage be placed where, at one glance, he might take in the luxuriant growth of a tropical forest and the restless sweep of the ocean, it is likely that the contrast between the teeming life of the one and the apparent desolation of the other would produce a profound impression on his mind, and that he would wonder that each inch of earth, every ray of sunlight, should be fought for on land while the great expanse of the sea lies vacant and idle. He would watch the gaily decked birds flit from branch to branch, the iridescent gleams from serpents as they glide through leafy coverts, or the gorgeous coloring of butterflies that flash through the dense shade of the jungle, and he would doubtless deride the suggestion that the sullen waters could vie with earth either in numbers or in the tints and shades of its inhabitants. The dark waves seem a fitting abode only for strange, mis-shapen monsters.

Such was the opinion that prevailed for centuries; and it has been only in recent years that it has undergone a change. Startling as it may appear, it is none the less true that in regard to population the land deserves the reproach of barrenness rather than the sea, for the latter contains a flora and fauna of a richness that the land cannot rival. To suit peculiar conditions of environment, marine organisms, like their terrestrial relatives, undergo many modifications of shape and function, and cause the natural history of the sea to be as replete with interest, and to present as wide a range for study, as that of earth and air. At first glance, such would not seem to be the case, for the conditions of marine life are apparently extremely uniform; but closer study shows that the uniformity is superficial, and the most trifling ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amination reveals differences in genera, in species and in individuals that are bewildering in their numbers.

In the light of our present knowledge, it seems probable that life on our earth originated in the sea, when and how we know not. Weismann* states it succinctly when he says: "The sea is the birthplace of all animal and plant life; from it animals and plants have spread themselves on the land and into the fresh waters." The condition of the sea at the early period at which life appeared gives strength to this supposition. The vast body of tepid water rolled its sluggish waves under masses of cloud, and in the same water, rich with the washings of the land, life came into being. It was a very low grade of life, merely a mass of jelly-like protoplasm, but it possessed the power of producing young and of undergoing changes that fitted it for higher things than simple existence. In time, organisms came about that were better adapted to securing food than certain others, or that were stronger and so captured and devoured the weaker species. As the seas grew more crowded, the struggle for food became more and more bitter, till the feebler forms of life were in danger of extermination unless they could find a refuge. These asylums were ready, but the fugitives had to undergo some changes before the promised safety was attainable. They probably advanced into the fresh water by slow degrees, each generation being forced further from the ocean by the struggle for food; but being freed from many natural enemies, the increase in numbers went on rapidly, until the weaker again became the prey of the stronger, and the bitter fight for existence became as keen as before. The scale, however, is smaller, and the rivers are still safer than the open sea for many organisms. For this reason, the shad, salmon and some other sea fish seek the upper reaches of the streams as a spawning ground, so that their young may attain a fair degree of maturity before being exposed to the numberless dangers that beset them in the ocean. The young fry have difficulties to overcome that suffice to eliminate the weaklings and teach the survivors to care for themselves; but it is more than likely that, in the migration of the spawning fish, we have but the repetition of the flight that populated our streams.

Another retreat was the bottom of the sea, and this was sought

* "*Das Thierleben im Bodensee.*" S. 5, Lindau, Stettner, 1877.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by those organisms that lacked the strength or the energy to stem the streams. More marked differentiation and modification are needed to enable an organism to live on the bottom than to exist in fresh water, for the conditions are widely different from those of the surface. Profound darkness prevails; for even the clearest water rapidly extinguishes the sun's rays, and a depth of a few hundred feet will bring eternal night. In the Lake of Geneva, photographic paper exposed at thirty fathoms below the surface was not affected, and Moseley * states that the "Challenger" expedition dredged up blind crustacea from 120 fathoms. Such is not always the case, however; for crustacea with well developed eyes have been found 2,500 feet below the surface, and this seems to point to an illumination of some sort.

In going from the shallow waters found on the continental plateaux to the great depths of thousands of fathoms, it must be remembered, the organisms have not fallen down, but have slowly and deliberately gone to the bottom. It has been a true emigration and has required a steady process of adaptation. The lack of light has made eyes unnecessary, so most deep sea forms are blind. This phenomenon is seen in the fish and crustacea that live in caves, and among them the same device is employed to replace vision as among the denizens of the oceanic depths. The other senses, especially touch, smell and hearing, are developed excessively, even new organs being formed for them. Along the head of the eyeless fish are papillæ consisting of new terminals that constitute an exquisite organ of touch; and the "Challenger" dredged from very deep water an organism, the *Astacus Zalencus,* closely allied to the common fresh water crayfish, which is eyeless, but has a long, delicate "nipper" that is its means of touch.

But all deep sea organisms are not blind. Some have very large eyes, and, under the law of functional development, these eyes must receive light. Since sunlight is absent, the illumination must come from another source, and this is the phosphorescence of many of the animals themselves. Every one is familiar with the phosphorescence of sea water at night, which is well known to be caused by myriads of minute organisms, but these are by no means the only luminiferous organisms. The profound depths have many inhabitants that shed a "hospitable ray,"

* H. N. Moseley, F. R. S., "Friday Evening Lecture," March 5, 1880, in "Nature," April 8, 1880.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which lightens to some degree the gloom of these realms of darkness.

Vision is not the only function that must be modified to adapt organizations to darkness, for the assimilative apparatus must also undergo change. Since light is essential to vegetation, plant life is absent, and the organisms are entirely carniverous. No seaweed exists below some thirty-five fathoms, but the surface is rich in organic *débris*. Vast quantities of vegetable matter are washed from the land, and the amount of seaweed growing along the coast is incalculable. Torn from its site, and rent into fragments by storms and cyclones, this mass is gathered into great bodies at some points, as in the Sargasso Sea and furnishes an unfailing food supply to many kinds of organisms. These vegetarians, in turn, become a prey to animals at a lower level, and vegetable food sufficient to supply the demand may thus be handed down through the bodies of successive layers of organisms.

A difficulty that appears to be more serious than any other is the enormous pressure of deep water. This amounts to about a ton to a thousand fathoms for every square inch of surface, but the deep sea organisms become as habituated to it as are the terrestrial ones to the weight of the atmosphere, and their tissues being permeated by water under the same pressure, they are not inconvenienced by it. They are exposed, however, to a danger that is very grave. They may "fall upward" into regions of diminished pressure, where their viscera distend and where they may even burst; a phenomenon similar to that experienced by mountain climbers, but greater in degree. That the normal pressure of the abysmal depths does not prohibit life is shown by the fact that living forms have been dredged from depths of over three statute miles.

The water of the bottom is intensely cold and perfectly still, save in so far as it may be affected by tides; for it is doubtful if currents extend below 100 fathoms. A temperature of 0°C. has been found at 500 fathoms at the Equator, while in deeper water the bottom temperature is two or three degrees lower, being kept from freezing by salt and pressure. In this still, cold water animals acquire the power of appropriating food by mere absorption from the nutrient fluid in which they lie, and the water supplies lime salts to globigerina and crustaceans from which past and future beds of chalk, limestone and marble have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or are being formed, silicon to diatoms and foods of many kinds to the infinite oceanic fauna.

This abundant supply of food, gathered without effort, leads to indolence; and animals living in the security of the bottom grow more and more inclined to remain stationary. They seek sites to which they may affix themselves, and in time settle down to a vegetative existence, from which neither love nor ambition can tempt them. Enclosed in a protecting shell, encased in a tube or buried in ooze, these organisms have ceased to make the slightest exertion, and, save for a brief period in early youth, are as inert and motionless as a piece of stone. Haeckel has shown that the life of each individual is an epitome of the history of its race, and, viewed in this light, the brief swimming stage of an oyster, for instance, acquires a melancholy interest as a relic of an earlier and higher existence, to which the race clings as a memento of former greatness.

Not content with sheer inaction, some marine animals have sunk to yet a deeper stage of degradation and have become pure parasites, borne about and nourished by more vigorous hosts. Some of these guests select strange places of residence. Crustacea are found in the pharynx of Salpa and in the mouths of menhaden; many protozoa live on the mantles of molluscs, and they may be responsible for some of the cases of poisoning that are reported from time to time. The whales and large turtles bear many sucking fish, as well as barnacles; and few of the active animals are free from some such incumbrance. At times, the relation is merely the extension of protection to the smaller. There is a tiny fish that lies between the poison curtains of the Physalia, or "Portuguese man-o'war," from whence it darts forth after its prey, but soon returns to shelter. As the poison of the Physalia is extremely irritating, sharks and the like rarely molest it; so these little fish have learned that under its dangerous mantle they can rest in safety.

Life on the bottom exists in its greatest beauty and profusion in water that is free from sediment and shifting sands. On our Atlantic seaboard the conditions are not very favorable, and, though annelids, molluscs and crustaceans abound, the more beautiful forms are scarce. The delicate sea-pen lives on the mud banks, and forms of great symmetry are found; but this is nothing compared with the wealth of a coral lagoon. The vertical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rays of the sun reflected from the bottom make the water as transparent as air; and, as the boat floats slowly across, one can gaze through the glass in the bottom of the boat on a scene of indescribable beauty. Great branching masses of coral of varying hue look like shrubs or even trees. Wonderful anthozoa, or flower animals, and the zoophytes, strange animal-plants, are distributed freely over the bottom. In other places, great lichen-covered rocks seem to be spangled with red, star-shaped flowers: and through and about it all the parrot fish flit, nibbling and browsing on the buds. No garden can equal these oceanic paradises in richness or variety of color; yet they are filled with animals almost to the exclusion of plant life. The lichen is a hydroid coral, the starlike flowers are but the vermilion ends of boring annelids, and the parrot fish do not nibble the stony coral but seek gorgonias, madrepores or small crustaceans. "Strange world in which the animal kingdom blossoms and the vegetable does not."

Such a lagoon would seem an ideal hunting field for pelagic organisms, yet the water yields little to the most persistent hauling. The reason is not far to seek. The sides and bottom are so lined with living animals that they constitute one gigantic mouth into which any unfortunate pelagic organism must fall. On coral reefs the nets will often be well filled on the side against which the surf thunders, and be empty on the lee; for the force of wind and wave is less destructive than the deceitful peace of the calm lagoon.

But marine life is by no means confined to the bottom. From the surface downward the ocean teems with life, to such a degree that naturalists stand aghast as they contemplate its infinite variety. First of all, stand the tiny protozoa, almost microscopic in size, yet on them the bulk of the other organisms subsist. The mass of animal and vegetable life existing in a body of water, and incapable of materially altering position by individual effort, is called the "plankton," and on its amount and character depends the ability of a sea, lake or stream to support life. Fish and other active animals are not included in the plankton, but their ova or larvæ do make part of it. This plankton varies in character in different parts of the sea, and some of its constituents form interesting objects of study. One of them is of great economic importance, as it is the source of marble, chalk and limestone.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is the globigerina, an animal made famous by Huxley's lecture on "A Piece of Chalk." This tiny creature begins life as a naked bit of protoplasm, but soon covers itself by a coat of lime, through which are fine perforations for threads of protoplasm to extrude. As growth proceeds and the chalk jacket becomes too small, a knob protrudes from the original protoplasm and, in turn, is covered by a layer of chalk. This is repeated until the mature animal seems to be made up of a number of spheres, each opening into a central chamber by a minute aperture. From this opening the group has received the name *foraminifera*. The surface of each sphere is pierced by fine holes, and through each hole a thread of protoplasm extends into the water for nourishment. After death, these sink to the bottom and make the "globigerina ooze," the future limestone and marble beds. The greater part of the bed of the Atlantic is composed of this ooze, and yet infinite numbers fall victims to the needs of more powerful neighbors.

The foraminifera are not the only organisms in which the sea is prolific, for the numbers of some of its groups surpass the most extravagant calculations. The British exploring steamer "Challenger" once steamed for two days through one species of Copepod; and the number of tiny creatures necessary to produce the phosphorescence of sea water may be imagined more readily than estimated. Other varieties are at times so abundant as to color the water for miles, a phenomenon that has produced many superstitions among sailors.

The scope of this paper will not permit an extended notice of individuals or even of families of marine organisms. The results of the past thirty years have shown the wealth of material yet to be investigated. The sea is an inexhaustible object of study, whether from a geographical, physical, geological or biological point of view. As yet only a few glimpses are available, because of the practical difficulties that block the way. Suppose some explorer from another planet, to whose vision our atmosphere was impenetrable, should float his air-ship some four or five miles from the earth's surface, and drop a hollow rod or a small net through the darkness. The chances are that he would fail to capture a single bird or animal; snakes, butterflies and almost every familiar animal would elude so obvious a danger, and the traveller would return to report the earth a desert. Yet, this is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practically what is done in deep-sea sounding and dredging, and on such data conclusions must be based. From time to time, some forcible reminder of the incompleteness of our knowledge comes to light. In the stomach of a red snapper a fish was found belonging to an otherwise unknown species and one that probably would have remained undiscovered for years but for a lucky accident. The fate of the shad after it returns to the sea is a mystery. Another example is the common fresh water eel, whose mode of reproduction has been a matter for speculation since the days of Aristotle. An old idea in regard to it was that the young eels sprang from mud. Later, it was thought that eels are hermaphrodite; but Dr. Theodore Gill of Washington and an Italian named Gassi have at last solved the problem. The eel that frequents the rivers is the female; and at the breeding time she descends to the sea to meet the male. When her destination is reached the dark dress is doffed and one of silver gray assumed. She then seeks a depth of some three thousand feet, where her mate awaits her. His coat is always silvery and his eyes are much larger than those of the female, so that few would suspect him of being allied to our common eel. The young were not recognized as such but were classed as a family of fish under the generic name of *Leptocephalus,* the *L. brevirostris* being the young of the common eel. Dr. Gill first showed the truth in the case of the conger eel, but this illustration, taken from so familiar an animal, shows how much still remains to be discovered.

In every civilized country numerous workers are eagerly studying the natural history of the sea. Something has been done; but more remains to be accomplished before we shall have solved the mysteries of the deep.

CHARLES MINOR BLACKFORD, JR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INFLUENCE OF THE NEW SUPPLIES OF GOLD.

BY GEORGE E. ROBERTS, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

THE low point in gold production, since the discovery in California, was touched about 1885, before the opening of the Transvaal field, and before the decline in silver had gone so far as to divert enterprise from silver mining to gold mining. For the five years from 1881 to 1885, inclusive, the average annual production of gold in the world was about $100,000,000. For the year 1890, the world's production was about $118,000,000. The output of the United States for 1890 was $32,000,000; for 1900, it was $78,000,000. The output of Australia for 1890 was $30,000,000; for 1900 it was $75,000,000. The output of South Africa for 1890 was about $8,000,000; in 1900, but for the war, it would have been over $100,000,000. With the restoration of peace in South Africa and the resumption of mining operations there, the yield of gold in the world may be expected to speedily reach $400,000,000 a year. Indeed, it is likely that the production of new gold from the mines in the next twelve years will equal the entire stock of gold held for monetary use in the world at the present moment.

The figures are startling, and even suggest the possibility of a new disturbance of values. Some very eminent geologists are now predicting that the flood has only begun, and some economists of great repute are already saying that the coming economic problem is: What shall be done with the new gold? Certain it is that the new supplies will be an important factor in business conditions in the next ten years.

When the South African War is finally ended, the mines that were producing at the rate of $100,000,000 a year at the time the war broke out will be speedily reopened; and, as the field is very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regular and well-defined, the output will probably be increased. The Cripple Creek district of the United States, Alaska and British Columbia all give assurance of increased production, to say nothing of many other promising districts in this country. In great degree, the new output is due to discoveries which have lowered the cost of treating ores and make deposits of low grade productive, which formerly could not be treated with profit. There are problems of this character yet to be worked out, and it is possible that production may be largely increased from known fields which up to this time have not been available. The yield from placers in this country, at present, is comparatively small; but great results are predicted from these deposits in the future by those who have confidence in the dredges and other mechanical devices which have been invented for the working of such properties. On the other hand, some of the most skillful and experienced mining engineers are of the opinion that the yield from river beds and placers will not be an important factor in the product for at least many years to come.

Without speculating upon new sources of supply, such as placers and ores of a grade not yet available, it is apparent that the reappearance of South Africa as a regular shipper to London and to the Continent of Europe at the rate of $2,000,000 per week will mean a powerful reinforcement of the money supply, and will exert an influence upon speculation and enterprise that will be felt in every market of the world and react upon every industry. Those who are calculating upon the time when the present era of confidence and enterprise will exhaust itself must take account of the stimulus which will be due to this circumstance and of the steady accessions of new supplies of gold for an indefinite period.

There is no more interesting subject for speculation or studious inquiry than the effect of this golden stream upon the markets, upon all the varied relations of individuals and classes, and upon the social life of the people. In so far as an enlargement of the money stock, with the expansion of credits which accompanies it, furnishes support to growing industries and promotes a natural and orderly development of the world's resources, it is a good thing. But when every man is at work, when all the productive forces of society are in full action, you cannot make the world richer by pouring money into it. You reach the point then where addition means dilution, where the new supply can find employ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment only by a decrease in the value of the old stock. When this occurs, all business relations based upon terms of money are disturbed; speculation, instead of industry, is promoted; economic waste and adventure run riot, and end in a collapse that disorganizes the whole industrial system. There are cities in the Mississippi Valley that have not yet covered the land that was laid out and sold as town lots in 1857, when the new gold from California and excessive issues of unregulated bank paper stimulated a bubble-like prosperity.

Additions to the money supply find their way first to the banks, and the immediate effect is to reduce the interest rate. A reduction in the rate of interest upon loans naturally increases the demand for and value of investments which yield a better return, and real estate, stocks and securities are thus forced to higher prices. When interest rates drop from six to four per cent., a security that is deemed safe to pay six per cent. rises from par to 150. The advance stimulates purchases not merely for investment, but for selling again, and thus a period of speculation is inaugurated. Speculation, like a great fire, creates its own currents, and fans itself into uncontrollable fury.

There are only two periods in the history of the money metals that can be compared to the present, and to which we may look for any experimental light upon the subject. One of these was the period following the discovery of America and the exploitation of the treasures of Mexico and Peru, and the other the period following the discoveries in California and Australia. In the period of one hundred and fifty years following the discovery of America, the depreciation of the metals was about two-thirds of their value; that is, in 1650 a given amount of gold or silver bought only about one-third as much as in 1500. The result, naturally, was extreme confusion in affairs, great suffering among wage-earners, and embarrassment to all whose incomes were fixed in terms of money. The "poor laws" of Queen Elizabeth's time have been attributed to the distress caused by the rise of food without equivalent compensation to the wage-earning class. The quarrel of Charles the First with Parliament was, undoubtedly, aggravated by the necessity for new taxes to overcome the declining value of the revenues; and some historians hold that it was the deadly money question, the bane of politicians in all ages, that cost him his head.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gold was discovered in California in 1848, and in Australia in 1851; and by 1852 these new fields were producing together over $100,000,000 a year. The first sign of the influx of the new gold into Europe was seen in the holdings of the Bank of England. They went up from about $40,000,000 in 1847 to $110,000,000 in June, 1853. To get this idle money into use, the bank reduced its regular rate of discount to two per cent.; and the market rate, for a considerable time, was reported at one and one-half per cent. The belief that the new supplies of gold would effect a permanent reduction of the rate of interest was so general that Mr. Gladstone, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed in Parliament a scheme to refund the consols below three per cent., and fixed the rate on exchequer bills at one and one-half per cent.

The conclusion that an increase in the stock of money will permanently affect interest rates is, however, a mistake, due to a confusion of ideas. An increase in the stock of money will eventually find expression in a depreciation of the value of money, as compared with commodities; but interest is a payment in kind, and suffers the same depreciation in value as the principal, without any reduction in the rate. The interest rate depends upon the supply of capital, which may be quite different from the supply of money. The first effect of an increase in the money supply is, however, clearly upon the interest rate. The new stock swells the bank reserves, rates are put down to encourage borrowing, and eventually the new stock is absorbed either by the actual growth of industries, or by a rise of prices, when a larger amount finds employment in doing the same work.

This occurred in the early fifties. There was a general revival of trade and industry in England, and on the Continent, due less, probably, to the fact that more money was available than to the new energy imparted by heavy emigration to the gold fields, the expenditures connected therewith and the growth of trade with the United States, which was then on the high tide of prosperity. The famine, the hard times and the political troubles of 1848 had already started emigration and depleted the labor supply. Then came the revival of the shipping trade and the ship-building industry, a new demand for manufactures, and a revival of building operations in the cities. The price of building materials went up fifty per cent. in London, every idle man was in demand, wages were raised from twelve to twenty-five per cent., and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general advance in all commodities took place. How much of this activity was due to the new gold, and how much to the natural reaction from the hard times that had lasted from 1846 to 1850, has always been in dispute. Then came the additional stimulus of war—the war in the Crimea—between Russia, on one side, and England, France, Turkey and Sardinia, on the other. This war drained heavy supplies of specie to the seat of operations in the East. England and France not only had to support their own troops there, but they bore, by means of subsidies, the expenses of their allies. And as the region in which the disbursements were made was poor in cash, and as commerce with it was small, bills of exchange were unavailable, and the remittances were made in coin. Under the two influences, expansion at home and the war exports, and another to be mentioned further on, the bank reserves rapidly disappeared. The rate of discount went up to five, six and seven per cent., and finally, in 1857, came the commercial crisis in Europe and America. The specie holdings in the bank of England were practically exhausted, the discount rate was ten per cent., and the Government had to intervene to save the bank.

Some of the most eminent statesmen and economists of the day, regarding the causes which brought about the collapse as temporary, still viewed the heavy gold output with concern. Chevalier, the French economist, published a book in which he carefully reviewed the situation and reached the conclusion that a heavy decline in the value of gold was inevitable, and he, therefore, recommended that France demonetize it. Holland, as early as 1854, took action on the safe side by demonetizing gold, and in 1857 Belgium followed her example.

But almost simultaneously with the war there sprang up a new demand for specie which proved to be the most potent of all influences in nullifying the effect of the new supplies, and that was the demand occasioned by the measures then begun for developing the resources of India.

In 1855-6 began the construction of the railway system of India, and immense sums of British capital were actually conveyed to India for that work. The result of furnishing cheap transportation from the interior to the coast was to increase greatly the exports of the country and pile up a larger trade balance in its favor, which had to be paid in silver. Prior to 1855, the exports of silver to India did not exceed $10,000,000 a year. In 1857,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they were about $100,000,000. This silver, to a great extent, was taken from the money stock of France and replaced with new gold from the mines. It was this sluice-way for silver to the East and the ability of France to take gold and give silver for it that prevented a further depreciation of gold at that time. For the eleven years, from 1855 to 1865, inclusive, the exports to India absorbed an amount of specie equal to eighty-five per cent. of the product of the new fields, which afforded a very satisfactory explanation for the failure of Mr. Chevalier's predictions. Chevalier's predictions might have come true, if something had not happened. The market value of predictions is greatly diminished by the fact that something usually does happen, and Chevalier's experience seems to suggest the wisdom of avoiding forecasts at this time. Notwithstanding the drain to India, Professor Stanley Jevons, writing in 1863 and reviewing the effect of the gold discoveries, reached the conclusion that gold had depreciated not less than nine per cent.—in his judgment nearer fifteen per cent., and perhaps more.

It seems reasonable to anticipate that what happened in the fifties will, to some extent, be repeated in this period. The times were never so favorable as now for the industrial development of the hitherto backward nations. In all the advanced countries, fully equipped with modern machinery, the production and accumulation of wealth is going on at a rate not only unprecedented, but almost beyond comparison with that of any other period. It is difficult in these countries to find opportunities to invest the annual savings of the people. This new capital is continually forced into occupations in which the returns are lower and lower as compared with the investments of the past, and the competition of this ever-coming stream forces down the return upon old investments as well. The result of this has been seen, first, in the destructive severity of competition, with a wasteful duplication of investments, a state that has not unfitly been called industrial anarchy; and, second, in the general organization of the industries which is the feature of to-day. But the same forces still exist, and they will continue to operate. There is no suppressing the competition of capital with capital, while new supplies continue to come on the market. Capital increases faster than population, and it follows that the only way in which the surplus can find employment is by competing with the existing stock.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is but one avenue of relief for capital in all these wealthy countries, and that is emigration. We have heard a good deal about the struggle for life in densely populated countries, and the relief afforded by emigration. That never was truer of population than it is of capital. If all of the capital owned in New England had to find investment at home and in the service of the people of those States, what would the return be? If all the capital owned in England had to find investment at home and in the service of the people at home, what would the return be? And if we ask the same question as to Germany, France and the Netherlands, we come to realize the pressure there is upon capital in all of these countries to emigrate. The United States in the past has been the great field of investment for Europe, but home capital is now abundant in every part of this country and must either accept lower returns or look abroad for employment. Of course, this is not saying that there is no more employment for capital in this country, but simply that capital here must be subject to the law of diminishing returns. It will be like cultivating the hills of New England when the prairies of the West were open.

This condition furnishes an impulse behind the latter day efforts to secure colonies. It is to find new and virgin fields for development. Some of the richest portions of the globe lie with their stores of natural wealth untouched, ready to be poured upon the world. South America, Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe are great fields for enterprise and capital. Their resources are to be opened by the modern machinery of production; their populations, in some degree at least, are to be organized and incorporated in the modern industrial system. An obstacle to investment in these countries in the past has been the instability or hostility of their governments; but that obstacle is being rapidly removed either by the pervading influence of progress, as in the case of Japan, or by the overshadowing influence and control of the civilized powers, as is inevitable with China. The time has come when all conditions seem to unite for the establishment of order, the investment of capital and the organization of industry in the hitherto neglected countries. The transfer of capital is facilitated and stimulated by a plentitude of money, the most liquid form of capital; and the progress of these new countries will create new channels which may be expected to draw and hold a large propor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the new supply. The foreign trade of Japan is eight times as large as it was twenty years ago; and in the last half of that period the scale of living expenditures, wages and commercial transactions generally has risen one hundred per cent. The loans and discounts of the banks of Japan have quadrupled in the last eight years. All of that means, of necessity, more money held in circulation and more in the reserves and hoards. Whenever a country enters fairly into the community of nations, and becomes an open field for investment, the industrial and financial conditions tend, more or less rapidly, to approximate those in other countries. And so, in the spread of industrial activity and the overflow of capital from the fields in which it has been pent up, we may expect to see something of a levelling of monetary stocks.

There is a great difference in the stocks of money held by even the countries of Western and Eastern Europe. Belgium and the Netherlands use about $24 *per capita;* Germany, over $20 *per capita;* Russia, less than $7 *per capita;* Roumania, Bulgaria and Turkey, some $3 or $4 *per capita;* and even Italy and Austria-Hungary, less than $10 *per capita.* These figures reveal the poverty, the low industrial development, the incomplete equipment of the populations in Eastern Europe.

Japan is making every effort to attract foreign capital; and, if she succeeds, she will absorb more money. Her present stock is between $3 and $4 per head. What China will require, when her industrious millions are equipped with machinery, we can only vaguely conjecture. Her present monetary stock is less than $2 per head.

At first thought, the new demand would seem likely to be for silver rather than gold, as silver is the natural currency of countries in which wages are low and transactions small in amount. There cannot be much use of gold for current transactions in any country where a five-dollar coin more than covers the average monthly wage. But the experience of Japan demonstrates how rapidly the scale of transactions rises, when a country has felt the stimulus of modern industrial life. Russia has recently put a large amount of gold into circulation. Gold will be the standard coin everywhere, and the money of reserves and hoards.

If the new supplies should at first be wholly taken up in the circulation of the principal commercial countries, and a general rise in prices is forced, that fact in itself will add to the induce-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments to develop the backward countries, where the costs of production remain low. Again, if the depreciation of gold becomes important, another influence will be felt, and that is the increased cost of mining. It will tend to discourage and check mining investments, as has been the case with silver in the last eight years. Professor Jevons in 1863 calculated that the depreciation of gold could not go beyond thirty per cent., for the reason that the loss in value would automatically diminish production. A very large proportion of the new yield is from low grade ores, the entire product from the Transvaal being from rock which yields only about ten dollars a ton. It would seem, therefore, that any depreciation of the metal as compared with the actual costs of production, would affect the output more widely now than at any time in the past. Upon this, as upon other phases of the subject, however, it is impossible to speak with any assurance, for the efforts of producers to overcome adverse conditions often yield extraordinary results.

The whole subject is, manifestly, one for speculation rather than calculation, so many and varied are the contingencies that will influence the final outcome. Speaking broadly, it seems safe to say that present conditions and probabilities favor the owner of real estate, fixed property and commodities, as against the owner of money and securities which yield a fixed return, or the salaried and wage-earning class. That there are corrective, compensating and reactionary influences goes without saying.

GEORGE E. ROBERTS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTICIPATIONS: AN EXPERIMENT IN PROPHECY.—III.

BY H. G. WELLS.

V. The Passing of Democracy.

In the preceding papers, in a clumsy, laborious way, there has been developed a smudgy, imperfect picture of the generalized, civilized state of the coming century. In terms vague enough at times, but never absolutely indefinite, the general distribution of the population in this state has been discussed, and its natural development into four great, but in practice intimately diffused, classes. It has been shown—I know not how convincingly—that, as the result of forces that are practically irresistible, a world-wide process of social and moral deliquescence is in progress, and that a really functional social body of engineering, managing men, scientifically trained and having common ideals and interests, is likely to segregate and disentangle itself from our present confusion of aimless and ill-directed lives. It has been pointed out that life is presenting an unprecedented and increasing variety of morals, *ménages,* occupations and types, at present so mingled as to give a general effect of greyness, but containing the promise of local concentration that may presently change that greyness into kaleidoscopic effects. We have permitted ourselves to take a few concrete glimpses of households, costumes, conveyances and conveniences of the coming time, but only as incidental realizations of points in this general thesis. And now we may consider how the existing arrangements for the ostensible government of the state are likely to develop through their own inherent forces, and how they are likely to be affected by the processes we have forecast.

So far, this has been a speculation upon the probable development of a civilized society *in vacuo.* Attention has been almost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exclusively given to the forces of development, and not to the forces of conflict and restraint. We have ignored the boundaries of language that are flung athwart the great lines of modern communication; we have disregarded the friction of tariffs, the peculiar groups of prejudices and irrational instincts that inspire one miscellany of shareholders, workers, financiers and superfluous poor, such as the English, to hate, exasperate, lie about and injure another similar miscellany, such as the French or the Germans. Moreover, we have taken very little account of the fact, that, quite apart from nationality, each individual case of the new social order is developing within the form of a legal government based on conceptions of a society that had been superseded by the advent of mechanism. It is this last matter that we are now about to take into consideration.

Now, this age is being constantly described as a "Democratic" age; "Democracy" is alleged to have affected art, literature, trade and religion alike in the most remarkable ways. It is not only tacitly present in the great bulk of contemporary thought that this "Democracy" is now dominant, but that it is becoming more and more overwhelmingly predominant as the years pass. Allusions to Democracy are so abundant, deductions from its influence so confident and universal, that it is worth while to point out what a large, hollow thing the word, in most cases, really is—a large, empty object in thought of the most vague and faded associations and the most attenuated contents; and to enquire just exactly what the original implications and present realities of "Democracy" may be. The enquiry will, I fancy, leave us with a very different conception of the nature and future of political arrangement from that generally assumed. We have already seen, in the discussion of the growth of great cities, that an analytical process may absolutely invert the expectation based on the gross results up to date;* and I believe it will be equally possible to show cause for believing that the development of Democracy also is, after all, not the opening phase of a world-wide movement which is to go on unbendingly in its present direction, but the

*No longer up to date now; for, since these articles were written, the English census returns for 1901 have come to hand, with a very complete endorsement of my fairly obvious inductions. A general attenuation of the more central urban districts has already begun, a steady transfer of population to outer and yet outer suburbs is already in progress. In this matter, I find another prophet, Mr. Sidney Low, made a prior forecast to the same effect as mine quite nine years ago in the Contemporary Review ("The Rise of the Suburbs.").

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first impulse of forces that will finally sweep round into a quite different path.

One may, I suppose, take the Rights of Man, as they are embodied in the French Declaration, as the ostentations of Democracy; our present Democratic state may be regarded as a practical realization of those claims. As far as the individual goes, the realization takes the form of an untrammelled liberty in matters that have heretofore been considered a part of social procedure, in the lifting of religious and positive moral compulsions, in the recognition of absolute property, and in the abolition of special privileges and special restrictions. Politically, modern Democracy takes the form of denying that any specific person or persons shall act, as a matter of intrinsic right or capacity, on behalf of the community as a whole. Its root idea is representation. Government is based primarily on election; every ruler is, in theory at least, a delegate and the servant of the popular will. It is implicit in the democratic theory that there is such a thing as a popular will, and this is supposed to be the net sum of the wills of all the citizens in the state, so far as public affairs are concerned. Its fundamental assumption, indeed, appears to be an ideal average citizen, modestly omniscient and amply posted and interested in all public affairs; it admits the possibility of individual error, but insists upon the collective moral and intellectual superiority to any producible superior individual. In its less perfect and more usual state, the democratic theory is advanced either as an ethical theory, which postulates an absence of formal acquiescence on the part of the governed as injustice, or as the least objectionable of all possible methods of public control, because it will suffer the minimum of general unhappiness. This ostensibly is Democracy. I know of no case for the elective democratic government of modern states that cannot be knocked to pieces in five minutes. It is manifest that upon countless, important, public issues there is no collective will and nothing in the mind of the average man except blank indifference, that an electoral system simply places power in the hands of the most skilful electioneers, that neither men nor their rights are identically equal but vary with every individual, and that the minimum or maximum general happiness is only so indirectly related to the public control that people will suffer great miseries from their governments unresistingly, and change their rulers out of sheer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lightness of heart. The case against all the prolusions of ostensible Democracy is, indeed, so strong that it is impossible to consider the present wide establishment of democratic institutions as being the outcome of any process of intellectual conviction; it arouses suspicion even whether ostensible Democracy may not be a mere rhetorical garment for essentially different facts, and upon that suspicion we will now enquire.

Democracy of the modern type, manhood suffrage and so forth, became a conspicuous phenomenon in the world only in the closing decades of the eighteenth century. Its genesis is so closely connected with the first expansion of the productive element in the state, through mechanism and a coöperative organization, as to point at once to a causative connection. New and potentially influential social factors began to appear—the organizing manufacturer, the intelligent worker, the skilled tenant, and the urban Abyss; and the traditions of the old land-owning, non-progressive, aristocratic monarchy that prevailed in Christendom, rendered it incapable, without some destructive shock or convulsion, of any reorganization to incorporate or control these new factors. In the case of the British Empire, an additional stress was created by the incapacity of the formal government to assimilate the developing civilization of the American colonies. Everywhere, there were new elements, not as yet clearly analyzed or defined, arising as mechanism arose; everywhere, the old traditional government and social system, defined and analyzed all too well, appeared increasingly obstructive, irrational and feeble in its attempts to include and direct these new powers. But now comes a point to which I am inclined to attach very great importance. The new powers were as yet shapeless. It was not the conflict of a new organization with the old, it was the preliminary dwarfing and deliquescence of the mature old beside the embryonic mass of the new. It was impossible then—it is, I believe, only beginning to be possible now—to estimate the proportions, possibilities and inter-relations of the new social orders out of which a social organization has still to be built in the coming years. No formula of definite reconstruction had been evolved, or has even been evolved yet after a hundred years. Even in these papers, I do but hint and clear away. And these swelling, inchoate, new powers, whose very birth-condition was the crippling, modification or destruction of the old order, were almost forced to formulate their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proceedings for a time, therefore, in general affirmative propositions, that were really, in effect, not affirmative propositions at all, but propositions of repudiation and denial. "These kings and nobles and people privileged in relation to obsolescent functions, cannot manage our affairs"—that was evident enough, that was the really essential question at that time; and, since no other effectual substitute appeared ready made, the working doctrine of the infallible judgment of humanity in the gross, as distinguished from the quite indisputable incapacity of sample individuals, became, in spite of its inherent absurdity, a convenient and acceptable working hypothesis.

Modern Democracy thus came into being, not, as eloquent persons have pretended, by the sovereign people consciously and definitely assuming power, but by the decline of old ruling classes in the face of the natural growth of mechanism and industrialism, and by the unpreparedness and want of organization in the new intelligent elements in the state. I have compared the human beings in society to a great and increasing variety of colors, tumultuously smashed up together and giving at present a general and quite illusory effect of grey; and I have attempted to show that there is a process in progress that will amount at last to the segregation of these mingled tints into recognizable distinct masses again. It is not a monotony, but an utterly disorderly and confusing variety, that makes this grey; but Democracy, for practical purposes, does really assume such a monotony.

Modern Democracy first asserted itself in the ancient kingdoms of France and Great Britain (counting the former English colonies in America as a part of the latter), and it is in the French and English speaking communities that Democracy has developed itself most completely. Upon the supposition we have made, Democracy broke out first in these two states, because they were leading the way in material progress, because they were the first states to develop industrialism, wholesale mechanisms, and great masses of insubordinate activity outside the recognized political scheme; and the nature and time and violence of the outbreak was determined by the nature of the superseded government and the amount of stress between it and the new elements. But the detachment of a great section of the new middle class from the aristocratic order of England to form the United States of America, and the sudden rejuvenescence of France by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the swift and thorough sloughing of its outworn aristocratic monarchy, the consequent wars and the Napoleonic adventure, checked and modified the parallel development that might otherwise have happened, in country after country, over all Europe west of the Carpathians. The monarchies that would probably have collapsed through internal forces and given place to modern democratic states were smashed from the outside world; and a process of reconstruction that has probably missed out the complete, formal democratic phase altogether (and which has been enormously complicated through religious, national and dynastic traditions) set in. Throughout America, in England and, after extraordinary experiments, in France, however, political democracy has in effect and legally established itself, most completely in the United States; and the reflection and influence of its methods upon the methods of all the other countries in intellectual contact with it have been so considerable as practically to make their monarchies as new in their kind, almost, as democratic republics. In Germany, Austria and Italy, for example, there is a press nearly as audible as in the more frankly democratic countries, and measurably akin in influence; there are constitutionally established legislative assemblies; and there is the same unofficial development of great financial and industrial powers, with which the ostensible government must make terms. In a vast amount of their public discussion, the postulates of democracy are clearly implicit. Just as much as the democratic republics of America, they are not based on classes, but on a confusion; they are, in their various degrees and with their various individual differences, governments of the grey.

It has been argued that the grey is illusory, and must sooner or later pass, and that the color that will emerge to predominance will take its shape as a scientifically trained middle class of an unprecedented sort, not arising out of the older middle classes, but replacing them. This class will become, I believe, at last consciously *the* State, controlling and restricting very greatly the three non-functional masses with which it is, as yet, almost indistinguishably mingled. The general nature of its formation within that existing confusion and its emergence may, I think, with a certain degree of confidence be already forecast, albeit at present its beginnings are singularly unpromising and faint. At present, the class of specially trained and capable people—doctors,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

engineers, scientific men of all sorts—is quite disproportionally absent from political life; it does not exist as a factor in that life; it is growing up outside that life, and has still to develop, much more to display, a collective intention to come specifically in. But the forces are in active operation to drag it into the center of the stage, for all that.

The modern democracy, or democratic quasi-monarchy, conducts its affairs as though there was no such thing as special knowledge or practical education. The utmost recognition it affords to the man who has taken the pains to know and specifically to do, is occasionally to consult him upon specific points and override his counsels in its ampler wisdom, or to intrust to him some otherwise impossible duty under circumstances of extreme limitation. The gunner, for example, may make and let off guns, but he may not say where they are to be let off; the engineer may move the ship and fire the battery, but only with a man who does not perfectly understand shouting instructions down a tube at him. The primarily functional men are ignored in the political scheme; it operates as though they did not exist, as though nothing in fact existed but the irresponsible wealthy and the manipulators of irresponsible wealth, on the one hand, and a great, grey, politically indifferent commonalty on the other. In the past, when I have speculated upon the future of humanity, I must confess I have quite thoughtlessly accepted this view of things and ignored altogether the way in which the growth of the new and continually more complicated mechanical fabric of social life must produce its new, distinctive class. And from this acceptation, I speculated upon the assumption that this present state of political affairs is the permanent one and produced the data of "When the Sleeper Wakes."

To begin with, we may consider the inherent characteristics of the democratic political system, and the probabilities of its development during the decades that must still elapse before this promised, capable class does in a definite manner emerge. In all the government of the grey, the real instrument of power is a political machine; in the democratic countries, a distinctly organized electoral machine.

There are two chief sets of parts in the machine that have a certain antagonistic relation to one another, that play against each other; and one's conception of coming developments is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessarily determined by the relative value one gives to these opposing elements. One may compare these two groups to the Power and the Work, respectively, at the two ends of a lever.* On the one hand, there is that which pays for the machine, which distributes salaries and rewards, subsidizes newspapers and so forth, the central influence.† On the other hand, there is the collectively grey voting mass, with certain prejudices and traditions, and certain laws and limitations of thought, upon which the newspapers work and which, within the confines of its inherent laws, they direct. If one dwell chiefly on the possibilities of the former element, one may conjure up a vision of a state "run" entirely by a group of highly forcible and intellectual persons—usually the dream takes the shape of financiers and their associates, their perfected mechanism working the elections boldly and capably, and their public policy being directed towards financial ends. One of the common prophecies of the future of the United States is such a domination by a group of trust organizers and political bosses. But a man or a group of men so strong and intelligent as would be needed to hold an entire party machine within the confines of his (or their collective) mind and will, could at the most be but a very transitory and incidental phenomenon in the history of the world. Either such an exploitation of the central control will have to be covert and subtle beyond any precedent in human disingenuousness, or else its domination will have to be very amply modified indeed by the requirements of the second factor and its proceedings become very largely the resultant of that second factor's forces. Moreover, very subtle men do not aim at things of this sort, or aiming fail, because subtlety of intelligence involves subtlety of character, a certain fastidiousness and a certain weakness. Now that the garrulous period, when a flow of language and a certain effectiveness of manner were necessary conditions to political preëminence, is passing away, political control falls more and more entirely into the hands of a barristerish, intriguing sort of person, with a

*The fulcrum, which is generally treated as being absolutely immovable, being the general belief in the theory of democracy.

†In the United States, a vast, rapidly developing country, with relatively much kinetic wealth, this central influence is the financial support of the Boss, consisting, for the most part, of active-minded, capable business organizers; in England, the land where irresponsible, realized wealth is at a maximum, a public-spirited section of the irresponsible, inspired by the tradition of an aristocratic functional past, qualifies the financial influence with an amateurish, indolent, publicly unprofitable integrity. In Germany, a really functional court occupies the place and plays the part of the central control of a permanently dominant party machine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tough-wearing, leathery, practical mind. The sort of people who will work the machine are people with "faith," as the popular preachers say—meaning, in fact, people who do not analyze—people who will take the machine as it is unquestioningly, shape their ambitions to it and (saving their vanity) work it as it wants to go. The man who will be boss will be the man who wants to be boss, who finds in being boss a complete and final satisfaction, and not the man who complicates things by wanting to be boss in order to be or do something else. The machines are governed to-day, and there is every reason to believe that they will continue to be governed, by masterful-looking resultants, masters of nothing but compromise.

If, on the other hand, we direct attention to the antagonistic element in the machine, to Public Opinion, to the alleged collective mind of the grey mass, and consider how it is brought to believe in itself, and its possession of certain opinions by the concrete evidence of daily newspapers and eloquent persons saying as much, we may also very readily conjure up a contrasted vision of extraordinary demagogues or newspaper syndicates working the political machine from that direction. So far as the demagogue goes, the increase of population, the multiplication of amusements and interests, the differentiation of social habits, the diffusion of great towns, all militate against that sufficient gathering of masses of voters in meeting-houses which gave him his power in the recent past. It is improbable that ever again will any flushed, undignified man, with a vast voice, a muscular face in incessant operation, collar crumpled, hair disordered and arms in wild activity, talking, talking, talking copiously out of the windows of railway carriages, on platforms, on hotel balconies, on tubs, barrels, scaffoldings, pulpits—tireless and undammable—rise to be the most powerful thing in any democratic state in the world. Continually, the individual, vocal demagogue dwindles, and the element of bands and buttons, the organization of the press and procession, the share of the machine, grows.

Mr. Harmsworth, of the London *Daily Mail,* in a very interesting article, has glanced at certain possibilities of power that may vest in the owners of a great system of world-wide, "simultaneous" newspapers; but he does not analyze the nature of the influence exercised by newspapers during the successive phases of the nineteenth century, nor the probable modifications of that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence in the years to come; and I think, on the whole, he inclines very naturally to overestimate the amount of intentional direction that may be given by the owner of the paper to the minds and acts of his readers, and to exceed the very definite limits within which that influence is confined. In the earlier Victorian period, the more limited, partly educated and still very homogeneous, enfranchised class had a certain habit of thinking; its tranquil assurance upon most theological and all moral and aesthetic points left political questions as the chief field of exercise for such thinking as it did; and, as a consequence, the dignified newspapers of that time were able to discuss, and indeed were required to discuss, not only specific situations but general principles. That, indeed, was their principal function; and it fell rather to the eloquent men to misapply these principles according to the necessity of the occasion. The papers did then very much more than they do now to mold opinion, though they did not direct affairs to anything like the extent of their modern successors. They made roads upon which events presently travelled in unexpected fashions. But the often cheaper and always more vivid newspapers that have come with the New Democracy do nothing to mold opinion. Indeed, there is no longer, upon most public questions (and, as I have tried to make clear in my previous paper, there is not likely to be any longer), a collective opinion to be molded. Protectionists, for example, are a mere band; Free Traders are a mere band; on all these details we are in chaos. And these modern newspapers simply endeavor to sustain a large circulation, and so merit advertisements by being as miscellaneously and vividly interesting as possible, by firing where the crowd seems thickest, by seeking perpetually and without any attempt at consistency, the greatest excitement of the greatest number. It is upon the cultivation and rapid succession of these inflammatory topics that the modern newspaper expends its capital, and trusts to recover its reward. Its general news sinks steadily to a subordinate position; criticism, discussion and high responsibility pass out of journalism; and the power of the press comes more and more to be a dramatic and emotional power—the power to cry "Fire!" in the theatre, the power to give enormous value for a limited time to some personality, some event, some aspect, true or false, without any power of giving a specific direction to the forces this distortion may set going.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That is the limit of the power of the modern newspaper of large circulation; and if our conclusion that human society has ceased to be homogenous and will presently display new masses segregating from a great confusion, that will be the limit of its power in the future. It may undergo many remarkable developments and modifications,* but none of these tends to give it any

*The nature of these modifications is an interesting side issue. There is every possibility of papers becoming at last papers of world-wide circulation, so far as the language in which they are printed permits, with editions that will follow the sun and change into to-morrow's issues as they go, picking up literary criticism here, financial intelligence there, here to-morrow's story and there to-morrow's scandal, and rolling out local provincialism like some vast intellectual garden roller at every revolution. This, for papers in English at any rate, is merely a question of how long it will be before the price of the best writing (for journalistic purposes) rises actually or relatively above the falling cost of long-distance electrical type-setting. Each of the local editions of these world-traveling papers, in addition to the identical matter that will appear almost simultaneously everywhere, will, no doubt, have its special matter and its special advertisements. Illustrations will be telegraphed just as well as matter, and probably a much greater use will be made of sketch and diagram than at present. If the theory advanced in these papers, of democracy as a transitory confusion, is sound, there will not be only one world paper of this sort—like Moses' serpent after its miraculous struggle—but several; and as the non-provincial segregation of society goes on, these various great papers will take on more and more decided specific characteristics, and lose more and more their local references. They will come to have not only a distinctive type of matter, a distinctive method of thought and manner of expression, but distinctive fundamental implications and a distinctive class of writer. The difference in character and tone renders the advent of any Napoleonic master of the newspaper world vastly more improbable than it would otherwise be. These specializing newspapers will, as they find their class, throw out many features that do not belong to that class. It is highly probable that they will restrict the space devoted to news and sham news—that forged and inflated stuff made in offices that bulks out the foreign intelligence of so many English papers, for example. At present every paper contains a little of everything—inadequate sporting stuff, inadequate financial stuff, vague literary matter, voluminous reports of political vaporings—because no newspaper is quite sure of the sort of readers it has; probably no newspaper has yet a distinctive sort of reader.

Many people, with their minds inspired by the number of editions which evening papers pretend to publish and don't, incline to believe that daily papers may presently give place to hourly papers, each with the last news of the last sixty minutes photographically displayed. As a matter of fact, no human being wants that, and very few are so foolish as to think they do; the only kind of news that any sort of people clamor for hot and hot is financial and betting fluctuations, lottery lists and examination results; and the elaborated and cheapened telegraphic and telephonic system of the coming days, with tapes (or phonograph to replace them) in every postoffice and nearly every private house, so far from expanding the department, will probably sweep it out of the papers altogether. One will subscribe to a news agency which will wire all the stuff one cares to have so violently fresh into a phonographic recorder, perhaps, in some convenient corner. There the thing will be in every house, beside the barometer, to hear or ignore.

With the separation of that function, what is left of the newspaper will revert to one daily edition—daily, I think, because of the power of habit to make the newspaper the specific business of some definite moments in the day—the breakfast hour, I suppose, or the "up to town" journey with most Englishmen now. Quite possibly some one will discover some day that there is now machinery for folding and fastening a paper into a form that will not inevitably get into the butter, or lead to bitterness in a railway carriage. This pitch of discovery reached, I incline to anticipate daily papers much more like the "Spectator" in form than these present mainsails of our public eye. They will probably not contain fiction at all, and poetry only rarely, because no one but a partial imbecile wants these things in punctual daily doses; and we are anticipating an escape from a period of partial imbecility.

My own culture and turn of mind, which is probably akin to that of a respectable mechanic of the year 2000, inclines me towards a daily paper that will have, in addition to its concentrated and absolutely trustworthy daily news, full and luminous accounts of new inventions, new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater political importance than it has now. And so, after all, our considerations of the probable developments of the party machine give us only negative results, so long as the grey social confusion continues. Subject to that continuance, the party machine will probably continue as it is at present, and democratic states and governments follow the lines upon which they run at the present time.

Now, how will the mergent classes of capable men presently begin to modify the existing form of government in the ostensibly democratic countries and bureaucratic monarchies? There will be very many variations and modifications of the methods of this arrival of an infinite complication of detailed incidents, but a

theories and new departures of all sorts (usually illustrated), witty and penetrating comments upon public affairs, criticisms of all sorts of things, reproductions of newly-produced pictures and works of art, and an ample amount of ably-written controversy upon everything under the sun. The correspondence columns, instead of being an exercising place for bores and conspicuous people who are not mercenary, would be the most ample, the most carefully collected, and the most highly paid for, of all in the paper I should prefer, and which my kindred mechanic will. This paper will have, of course, many pages of advertisements, and these will usually be well worth looking through, for the more intelligent editors of the days to come will, of course, edit this department just like any other, and classify their advertisements in a descending scale of freshness and interest that will also be an ascending scale of price. The advertiser who wants to be an indecent bore and vociferate for the ten-millionth time some flatulent falsehood about a pill, for instance, will pay at nuisance rates. Probably many papers will refuse to print nasty and distressful advertisements about people's insides at all. The entire paper will be as free from either greyness or offensive stupidity in its advertisement columns as the shop windows in Bond street to-day, and for much the same reason—because the people who go that way don't want that sort of thing.

It has been supposed that, since the real income of the newspaper is derived from advertisements, large advertisers will combine in the future to own papers confined to the advertisements of their specific wares. Some such monopoly is already attempted; several publishing firms own or partially own a number of provincial papers, which they adorn with strange "Book Chat" columns conspicuously deficient in interesting facts; and a well-known cycle-tire firm supplies "Cycling" columns that are mere pedestals for a certain make of tire. Many quack firms publish and give away annual almanacs replete with economical illustrations, internal details and bad jokes. But I venture to think that these suggestions and attempts are made with a certain disregard of the essential conditions of sound advertisement. Sound advertisement consists in perpetual alertness and newness, in appearance in new places and in new aspects, in the constant access to fresh minds. The devotion of a newspaper to the interest of one particular make of a commodity or group of commodities, will inevitably rob its advertisement department of most of its interest for the habitual readers of the paper. That is to say, the newspaper will fail in what is one of the chief attractions of a good newspaper. Moreover, such a devotion will react upon all the other matter in the paper, because the editor will need to be constantly alert to exclude tedious reflections upon the Health-Extract-of-Horse-Flesh or Saved-by-Boiling Jam. His sense of this relation will taint his self-respect, and make him a less capable editor than a man whose sole affair is to keep his paper interesting. To these more interesting rival papers the excluded competitor will be driven, and the reader will follow in his wake. There is no more sense in the proprietor of an article in popular demand buying or creating a newspaper to contain all his advertisements than there would be in his buying a coal pit for the same purpose. Such a privacy or advertisement will never work, I think, on a large scale; it is probably at or near its maximum development now; and this anticipation of the advertiser-owned paper, like that of hourly papers and that wonderfully-powerful cosmic newspaper syndicate, is simply another instance of prophesying based only on a present trend, an expansion of the obvious, instead of an analysis of determining forces.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general proposition will be found to hold good. The supersession of the party machine in the purely democratic countries, and of the official choice of the rich and privileged rulers in the more monarchical ones, by capable, operative and administrative men inspired by the belief in a common theory of social order, will come about, peacefully and gradually, or violently as a revolution, but inevitably because of international competition and the imminence or disasters of war.

That all these governments of confusion drift towards war, with a spacious impulse and a final vehemence quite out of comparison greater than the warlike impulses of former times, is a remarkable but by no means inexplicable thing. A tone of public expression, jealous and patriotic to the danger point, is an unavoidable condition under which these governments of confusion exist. To be patriotically quarrelsome is imperative upon the party machines that will come to dominate the democratic countries. They will not possess detailed and definite policies and creeds, because there are no longer any detailed and definite public opinions; but they will, for all that, require some ostensible purpose to explain their cohesion, some hold upon the common man that will insure his appearance in numbers at the polling place, sufficient to save the government from the raids of small but determined sects. That hold can be only of one sort. Without moral or religious uniformity, with interests as involved and confused as a heap of spelicans, there remains only one generality for the politician's purpose, the ampler aspect of a man's egotism, his pride in what he imagines to be his particular kind—his patriotism. In every country amenable to democratic influences there emerges or will emerge a party machine, vividly and simply patriotic, and indefinite upon the score of any other possible consideration between man and man. This will hold true, not only of the ostensibly democratic states, but also of such reconstituted modern monarchies as Italy and Germany; for they, too, for all their legal difference, rest also on the grey.

Now, patriotism is not a thing that flourishes in the void; it needs a foreigner. A national and patriotic party is an anti-foreign party; the altar of the modern god, Democracy, will cry aloud for the stranger men. Simply to keep in power, and out of no love of mischief, the government or the party machine will have to insist upon dangers and national differences, to keep the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voter to the poll by alarms, seeking ever to taint the possible nucleus of any competing organization with the repute of external influence. The party press will play the watch dog, and allay all internal dissensions with its warning bay at some adjacent people; and the adjacent peoples, for reasons to be presently expanded, will be continually more sensitive to such baying. Already, one sees country yelping at country all over the modern world, not only in the matter of warlike issues, but with a note of quite furious commercial rivalry—quite furious and, indeed, quite insane, since its ideal of trading enormously with absolutely ruined and tradeless foreigners, exporting everything and importing nothing, is obviously outside reason altogether. The inexorable doom of these governments based on the grey, is to foster enmity between people and people. Even their alliances are but sacrifices to intenser antagonisms. And the phases of the democratic sequence are simple and sure. Forced on by a relentless competition, the tone of the outcries will become fiercer and fiercer, the occasions of excitement, the perilous moments, the ingenuities of annoyance, more and more dramatic—from the mere emptiness and disorder of the general mind! Jealousies and anti-foreign enactments; tariff manipulations and commercial embitterments, destructive, foolish, exasperating obstructions that benefit no human being will minister to this craving without completely allaying it. Nearer and ever nearer the politicians of the coming times will force one another towards the verge; not because they want to go over it, not because any one wants to go over it, but because they are by their very nature compelled to go that way, because to go in any other direction is to break up and lose power. And, consequently, the final development of the democratic system, so far as intrinsic forces go, will be not the rule of the boss nor the rule of the trust nor the rule of the newspaper, no rule, indeed, but international rivalry, international competition, international exasperation and hostility, and at last—irresistible and overwhelming—the definite establishment of the rule of that most stern and educational of all masters —*War*.

At this point, there opens a tempting path, and along it historical precedents, like a forest of notice boards, urge us to go. At the end of the vista stands the figure of Napoleon, with Cæsarisms written beneath. Disregarding certain alien considerations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a time, assuming the free working out of democracy to its conclusion, we perceive that, in the case of our generalized state, the party machine, together with the nation entrusted to it, must necessarily be forced into passionate national war. But, having blundered into war, the party machine will have an air of having accomplished its destiny. A party machine or a popular government is, surely, as likely a thing to cause a big disorder of war and as unlikely a thing to conduct it, as the wit of man, working solely to that end, could ever have devised. I have already pointed out why we can never expect an elected government of the modern sort to be guided by any far reaching designs; it is constructed to get office and keep office, not to do anything in office; the conditions of its survival are to keep appearances up and taxes down;* and the care and management of army and navy is quite outside its possibilities. The military and naval professions in our typical modern state will subsist very largely upon tradition, the ostensible government will interfere with rather than direct them, and there will be no force in the entire scheme to check the corrupting influence of a long peace, to insist upon adequate exercises for the fighting organization, to insure an adequate adaptation to the new and perpetually changing possibilities of untried apparatus. Incapable, but confident and energetic, persons having political influence will have been permitted to tamper with the various arms of the service, the equipment will be largely devised to create an impression of efficiency in time of peace in the minds of the general voting public, and the really efficient soldiers will either have fretted themselves out of the army, or have been driven out as politically non-effective—

*One striking illustration of the imbecile possibilities of party government came to light during the last term of office of the present patriotic British government. As a demonstration of patriotism (and as a vigorous stimulant to foreign effort), large sums of money were voted annually for the purpose of building warships, and the patriotic common man paid the taxes gladly with a dream of irresistible naval predominance to sweeten the payment. But the money was not spent on warships; only a portion of it was spent, and the rest remained to make a surplus and warm the heart of the common man in his tax-paying capacity. This artful dodge was repeated for several years; the artful dodger is now a peer, no doubt abjectly respected, and nobody in the most patriotic party so far evolved is a bit the worse for it. In the organizing experiments of all popular governments, as in the prospectuses of unsound companies, the disposition is to exaggerate the nominal capital at the expense of the working efficiency. Democratic armies and navies are always short, and will always be short of ammunition, paint, training and reserve stores, battalions and ships alike count as units and go short-handed, and democratic army reform almost invariably works out to some device for multiplying units by fission, and counting men three times over instead of twice in some ingenious and plausible way. And this must be so, because the sort of men who come inevitably to power under democratic conditions are men trained by all the conditions of their lives so to set appearances before realities, as at last to become utterly incapable of realities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troublesome, innovating persons, anxious to spend money upon "fads." So armed, the New Democracy will blunder into war; and the opening stage of the next great war will be the catastrophic breakdown of the formal armies, shames and disasters, and a disorder of conflict between more or less equally matched masses of stupefied, scared and infuriated people.

Now, foreseeing this, it is easy to step into the trap of the Napoleonic precedent. One hastens to foretell that, either with the pressure of coming war, or in the hour of defeat, there will arise the Man. He will be strong in action, epigrammatic in manner, personally handsome and continually victorious. He will sweep aside parliaments and demagogues, carry the nation to glory, reconstruct it as an empire, and hold it together by circulating his profile and organizing further successes. He will—I gather this from chance lights upon contemporary anticipations—codify everything, rejuvenate the papacy, or at any rate galvanize Christianity, erect countless monuments to Napoleon, Octavius Cæsar and Thomas Carlyle, organize learning in Academies, and prescribe a wonderful educational system. The grateful nations will once more deify a lucky and aggressive egotism. And there the vision loses breath.

Nothing of the sort is going to happen, or, at any rate, if it happens it will happen as an interlude, as no necessary part in the general progress of the human drama. The world is no more to be recast by individuals than a city is to be lit by skyrockets. The Purpose of Things emerges upon spacious issues, and the day of the human leaders is past. The analogies and precedents that lead one to forecast the coming of military one-man dominions, the coming of such other parodies of Cæsar as that misapplied and speedily futile chess champion, Napoleon I., contrived, are false. They are false, because they ignore two correlated things —first, the steady development of this new, unprecedented, educated class as a necessary aspect of the expansion of science and mechanism; and, secondly, an absolute revolution in the art of war that science and mechanism are bringing about. This latter consideration the next of these papers will expand; but here, in the interests of the discussion, we may in general terms anticipate its gist. War in the past has been a thing entirely different in its nature from what war, with the apparatus of the future, will be; it has been showy, dramatic, emotional and restricted. War

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the future will be none of these things. War in the past was a thing of days and heroisms; battles and campaigns rested in the hand of the great commander, who stood out against the sky, picturesquely on horseback, visibly controlling it all. War in the future will be a question of preparation, of long years of foresight and disciplined imagination; there will be no decisive victory, but a vast diffusion of conflict. It will depend less and less on controlling personalities and driving emotions, and more and more upon the intelligence and personal quality of a great number of skilled men. All this, the next paper will expand. It will become apparent, perhaps almost suddenly, that the whole apparatus of power in the country is in the hands of a new class of intelligent and scientifically educated men. They will probably, under the development of warlike stresses, be discovered, as it were, they will discover themselves almost surprisingly, with roads and railways, carts and cities, drains, food supply, electrical supply and water supply, guns and such implements of destruction and intimidation as men scarcely dream of yet, gathered in their hands. And they will be discovered, too, with a growing common consciousness of themselves as distinguished from the grey confusion, a common purpose and implication that the fearless analysis of science is already bringing to light. It will be made quite evident that what is now, indeed, only a pious opinion —namely, that wealth is, after all, no ultimate power at all, but only an influence among aimless, police-guarded men—is, after all, true. So long as there is peace, these capable men may be mitigated and gagged and controlled, and the ostensible present order may flourish still in the hands of that other class of men which deals with the appearances of things. But, as some supersaturated solution will crystallize out with the mere shaking of the beaker, so must the new order of men come into visibly organized existence through the concussions of war.

H. G. WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN EXEMPLARY CITIZEN.*

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

If one were to name Paul Dunbar with Booker T. Washington, Frederick Douglass and Charles W. Chesnutt, one would have a group of Americans who, even if they were not known to be Afro-Americans (I did not invent the term, I am glad to say; but I am glad to use it, for it serves), would lift themselves far above our undistinguished average, white or black. The fact that they are Afro-Americans is not the chief fact concerning them. It was, indeed, the function of Douglass to be an Afro-American, and that is in a way the function of Mr. Washington. But when one reads what they have written or spoken, one no more feels a quality of Afro-Americanism in them than one feels it in the work of Mr. Dunbar or Mr. Chesnutt, whose function is to be literary artists. Mr. Dunbar is entirely black, and Mr. Chesnutt, to the unskilled eye, is entirely white. Mr. Washington, as Douglass was, is a half-blood. But they are all colored people, and it is only just to credit their mother-race with their uncommon powers and virtues, since, if they were weak or vicious, it must bear the blame and the shame of their shortcoming. So far as I can make out from the study of their minds in their books, they are of one blood with their fathers or forefathers. There is, apparently, no color line in the brain. One almost wishes there were, and that there were a region of thought-life, apart from ours, characterized by something strange, something different, some hint, even, of the ancestral Grand Custom. The ancestral Cakewalk seems to intimate itself for a moment in Mr. Washington's dedication of

* "Up from Slavery: An Autobiography," by Booker T. Washington. Doubleday, Page & Co.
"Frederick Douglass, the Colored Orator," by Frederick May Holland. Funk & Wagnalls Co.
"Frederick Douglass" (Beacon Biographies), by Charles W. Chesnutt. Small, Maynard & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his autobiography to his "wife, *Mrs.* Margaret James Washington," and his "brother, *Mr.* John H. Washington;" but nothing is less characteristic of the author than the cakewalk, and its apparent flourish, in this instance, has a pathos to which, rightly seen, one wishes to uncover. It is part of the proud tenderness, the loving loyalty to family and race, which is one of the finest traits of this remarkable book and of this remarkable man.

I.

Except for the race ignominy and social outlawry to which he was born, the story of Booker T. Washington does not differ so very widely from that of many another eminent American. His origin was not much more obscure, his circumstances not much more squalid, than Abraham Lincoln's, and his impulses and incentives to the making of himself were of much the same source and quality. He was born in slavery, but not in poverty much more abject, more absolute; and he was like another great American of his own color, in those conditions of his birth which forbade him to know his father or even his father's name. They each understood vaguely that he was a white man on a neighboring plantation; but they had never any reason to ascribe to him those gifts or talents which we are fond of attributing to the white half of a mulatto's origin when he shows them. The mother of Douglass died when he was a child She could do nothing, in that hopeless period of slavery, to fit him for his wonderful career. He remembered her as a tall, straight young woman, handsome and proud, with "deep black, glossy" skin, and features like those of an Egyptian king in a picture he had seen. She was the only person of her color on the plantation who could read; yet Douglass no more learned of his mother to read than Booker Washington, whose mother could not have taught him from her own knowledge, but who was as ambitious for his education as if she could have led or followed him. There is nothing more touching in his book than the passages which record her devotion and her constant endeavor to help him find the way so dark to her. There is nothing more beautiful and uplifting in literature than the tender reverence, the devout honor with which he repays her affection. His birth was a part of slavery, and she was, in his eyes, as blameless for its conditions as if it had all the sanctions. The patience, the fearless frankness, with which he accepts and owns the facts, are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not less than noble; and it is not to their white fathers, but to their black mothers, that such men as Frederick Douglass and Booker Washington justly ascribe what is best in their natures.

II.

The story of his struggle for an education is the story of Booker Washington's life, which I am not going to spoil for the reader by trying to tell it. He has himself told it so simply and charmingly that one could not add to or take from it without marring it. The part of the autobiography which follows the account of his learning to read and write, in the scanty leisure of his hard work in the West Virginia coal mines, and of his desperate adventure in finding his way into Hampton Institute, is, perhaps, more important and more significant, but it has not the fascination of his singularly pleasing personality. It concerns the great problem, which no man has done more than he to solve, of the future of his race, and its reconciliation with the white race, upon conditions which it can master only through at least provisional submission; but it has not the appeal to the less philosophized sympathies which go out to struggle and achievement. It is not such interesting reading, and yet it is all very interesting; and if the prosperity of the author is not so picturesque as his adversity, still it is prosperity well merited, and it is never selfish prosperity.

Booker Washington early divined the secret of happiness as constant activity for the good of others. This was the first thing he learned from the example of the admirable man who became his ideal and his norm: he formed himself, morally at least, upon General Armstrong, and in a measure he studied his manner—his simple and sincere manner—oratorically.

This must be evident to any one who has heard both men speak. It was most apparent to me when I heard Mr. Washington speak at a meeting which had been addressed by several distinguished white speakers. When this marvellous yellow man came upon the platform, and stood for a moment, with his hands in his pockets, and with downcast eyes, and then began to *talk* at his hearers the clearest, soundest sense, he made me forget all those distinguished white speakers, and he made me remember General Armstrong, from whom he had learned that excellent manner. It was somewhat the manner of Salvini, when, in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character of another colored man, he defends himself to the Venetian Senate for having taken away Brabantio's daughter; and, perhaps, the poet was divining and forecasting the style of the race in the plain, unvarnished reasoning of Othello.

What strikes you, first and last, in Mr. Washington is his constant common sense. He has lived heroic poetry, and he can, therefore, afford to talk simple prose. Simple prose it is, but of sterling worth, and such as it is a pleasure to listen to as long as he chooses to talk. It is interfused with the sweet, brave humor which qualifies his writing, and which enables him, like Dunbar, to place himself outside his race, when he wishes to see it as others see it, and to report its exterior effect from his interior knowledge. To do this may not be proof of the highest civilization, but it is a token of the happiest and usefullest temperament.

III.

The dominant of Mr. Washington's register is *business;* first, last and all the time, the burden of his song is the Tuskegee Industrial Institute. There is other music in him, and no one who reads his story can fail to know its sweetness; but to Tuskegee his heart and soul are unselfishly devoted, and he does not suffer his readers long to forget it. He feels with his whole strength that the hope of his race is in its industrial advancement, and that its education must, above all, tend to that. His people must know how to read and write in order to be better workmen; but good workmen they must be, and they must lead decent, sober, honest lives to the same end. It was the inspiration of this philosophy and experience which enabled him, in his famous speech at the opening of the Atlanta Exposition, to bring the white race into kindlier and wiser relations with the black than they had known before. Social equality he does not ask for or apparently care for; but industrial and economic equality his energies are bent upon achieving, in the common interest of both races. Of all slights and wrongs he is patient, so they do not hinder the negro from working or learning how to work in the best way.

The temper of his mind is conservative, and, oddly enough, that seems to be the temper of the Afro-American mind whenever it comes to its consciousness. The Anglo-American of the South may be, and often has been, an extremist, but the Afro-American,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so far as he has made himself eminent, is not. Perhaps, it is his unfailing sense of humor that saves him from extremism. At any rate, cool patience is not more characteristic of Mr. Washington than of Mr. Dunbar or Mr. Chesnutt or of Frederick Douglass himself. Douglass was essentially militant; he was a fighter from 'way back, from the hour when he conceived the notion that if the slave would always fight the man who attempted to whip him, there would be no whipping, and he did fight his master upon this theory, and beat him; his war with slavery was to the death. Yet he laid himself open to the blame of certain Abolitionists because he would not go all lengths with them, and he refused to take part in the attempt of John Brown, whom he loved with his whole heart. He kept amidst the tumult of his emotion the judicial mind, and he did not lose his head in the stormy career of the agitator.

This calm is apparently characteristic of the best of the race, and in certain aspects it is of the highest and most consoling promise. It enables them to use reason and the nimbler weapons of irony, and saves them from bitterness. By virtue of it Washington, and Dunbar and Chesnutt enjoy the negro's ludicrous side as the white observer enjoys it, and Douglass could see the fun of the zealots whose friend and fellow-fighter he was. The fact is of all sorts of interesting implications; but I will draw from it, for the present, the sole suggestion that the problem of the colored race may be more complex than we have thought it. What if upon some large scale they should be subtler than we have supposed? What if their amiability should veil a sense of *our* absurdities, and there should be in our polite inferiors the potentiality of something like contempt for us? The notion is awful; but we may be sure they will be too kind, too wise, ever to do more than let us guess at the truth, if it is the truth.

IV.

Mr. Washington's experience of our race has been such as to teach him a greater measure of kindness for it than many of his race have cause to feel. His generous enterprise prospers by our bounty, which he owns, with rather more tolerance for the rich than the New Testament expresses. So far from bidding them "go to and howl," he is disposed to deprecate the censure which some of the public prints (perhaps in too literal a discipleship)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heap upon them. With such open hands he believes there must go good hearts, and he finds not excuse only, but justification, for English aristocrats as well as American plutocrats. He does not know but there may be good reasons for the division of society into classes, and for the frank recognition of server and served, as in England. This may be because Mr. Washington's clock does not always strike twelve; and it may be because he and the nobility and gentry are right. In either case, it is interesting in itself and ingenuous in him. It makes assurance doubly sure that the negro is not going to do anything dynamitic to the structure of society. He is going to take it as he finds it, and make the best of his rather poor chances in it. In his heart is no bitterness. If his rights are taken away, he will work quietly on till they are given back. No doubt, it is the wisest way. If he keeps faithfully and quietly at work, he will presently be an owner of the earth and have money in the bank, and from such their rights cannot long be withheld. They can buy the strong arm that robs them; they can invoke the law to make the oppressor get off the land.

Mr. Washington's way seems, at present, the only way for his race, which has not even the unrestricted suffrage to its friend, as white labor has. Perhaps, if it had, it would make no more of it than white labor does. The ballot which was once supposed to

> "execute the freeman's will
> As lightning does the will of God,"

seems to operate tangentially, and not to carry with it the proof of a direct volition; but so does and does not the lightning, for that matter. What is certain is that Mr. Washington has entire faith in his plan, and that, while he is not insensible or indifferent to the unlawful disabilities of his people, he sees no hope in their making a fight against them, and further alienating the stronger race about them. By precept and by practice he counsels, not a base submission to the Southern whites, but a manly fortitude in bearing the wrongs that cannot now be righted, and a patient faith in the final kindliness and ultimate justice of the Anglo-Americans, with whom and by whom the Afro-Americans must live. He has seen the party which freed the slaves unable through forty years of interrupted power to keep them politically free or to make them socially equal with their former masters, and his counsel, enforced by his eminent example, has been for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Afro-American to forego politics, at least for the present, and to put from him indefinitely the illusive hope of associating with the Anglo-American.

If the Afro-American could only realize the fact that many Anglo-Americans are not worth associating with, it might help him put the vain desire from him. If he would reflect upon the fact, which must be perfectly obvious to him as cook, butler, waiter and coachman, that some of us Anglo-Americans will not associate with other Anglo-Americans, and that if we have "exaggerated incomes" we will not, according to Mr. Depew, admit Anglo-Americans "of distinction in art and letters," to our tables or ball-rooms or coaching parties, he will be still better able to console himself under his deprivation. Probably, he would be willing to consort with even such outcasts from exclusive white society; but, with his native love of splendor, I think he would prefer the exclusive society, and, upon the whole, he might be more fitted for it.

He is as likely to get into it as into any other white society, though I am not sure that he would be shut out from the very lowest, which sometimes embraces even Chinamen. At that level, he would find himself at home in the traditions of poverty, which are much the same, whether it is the poverty of the slave or of the freeman. Mr. Washington remembers, as one of the most significant features of the slave life to which he was born, that his people had no tables or beds where they ate or slept. They never sat down to meals, but caught up a bone or a crust and fed upon it wherever they happened to be. They never went to bed, but dropped down anywhere, and slept upon a heap of rags or the bare floor. But such conditions are not distinctive of slavery. If Mr. Washington were to go slumming, I will undertake that he should see on the East Side in New York very much the same conditions, very much the same usages. I myself have been received (without the express invitation of the hosts; one doesn't stand upon ceremony with such people) in tenements where they seemed to prevail, and I suspect that they prevail in a degree which would astonish the Afro-American sufficiently detached from the past of his race to view it objectively, and to realize the connotative facts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V.

White men rise from squalor almost as great as that which has left no taint upon the mind and soul of the born thrall, Booker T. Washington. But it must be remembered to his honor, and to his greater glory as a fighter against fate, that they rise in the face of no such odds as he has had to encounter. No prejudice baser than the despite for poverty bars their way. But the negro who makes himself in our conditions, works with limbs manacled and fettered by manifold cruel prepossessions. These prepossessions yield at certain points to amiability, to mildness, to persistent submissiveness, but at other points they yield to nothing.

In spite of them, though never in defiance of them, Booker T. Washington has made himself a public man, second to no other American in importance. He seems to hold in his strong grasp the key to the situation; for if his notion of reconciling the Anglo-American to the Afro-American, by a civilization which shall not seem to threaten the Anglo-American supremacy, is not the key, what is? He imagines for his race a civilization industrial and economical, hoping for the virtues which spring from endeavor and responsibility; and apparently his imagination goes no farther. But a less deeply interested observer might justify himself in hoping for it, from the things it has already accomplished in art and literature, a civilization of high æsthetic qualities.

As for the man himself, whose winning yet manly personality and whose ideal of self-devotion must endear him to every reader of his book, something remains to be said, which may set him in a true perspective and a true relation to another great Afro-American, whose name could not well be kept out of the consideration. Neither by temperament nor by condition had Frederick Douglass the charm which we feel when Booker T. Washington writes or speaks. The time was against him. In that time of storm and stress, the negro leader was, perforce, a fighter. The sea of slavery, from which he had escaped with his bare life, weltered over half the land, and threatened all the new bounds of the Republic. By means of the Fugitive Slave Law, it had, in fact, made itself national, and the bondman was nowhere on American soil safe from recapture and return to his master. Frederick Douglass had to be bought, and his price had to be paid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in dollars by those who felt his priceless value to humanity, before he could be to it all that he was destined to become.

It would have been impossible that the iron which had entered into the man's soul should not show itself in his speech. Yet, his words were strangely free from violence; the violence was in the hatred which the mere thought of a negro defying slavery aroused in its friends. If you read now what he said, you will be surprised at his reasonableness, his moderation. He was not gentle; his life had been ungentle; the logic of his convictions was written in the ineffaceable scars of the whip on his back. Of such a man, you do not expect the smiling good humor with which Booker T. Washington puts the question of his early deprivations and struggles by. The life of Douglass was a far more wonderful life, and when it finds its rightful place in our national history, its greater dynamic importance will be felt.

Each of these two remarkable men wrought and is working fitly and wisely in his time and place. It is not well to forget slavery, and the memory of Frederick Douglass will always serve to remind us of it and of the fight against it. But it is not well to forget that slavery is gone, and that the subjection of the negro race which has followed it does not imply its horrors. The situation which Booker T. Washington deals with so wisely is wholly different from the situation which Douglass confronted, and it is slowly but surely modifying itself. The mild might of his adroit, his subtle statesmanship (in the highest sense it is not less than statesmanship, and involves a more than Philippine problem in our midst), is the only agency to which it can yield. Without affirming his intellectual equality with Douglass, we may doubt whether Douglass would have been able to cope so successfully with the actual conditions, and we may safely recognize in Booker T. Washington an Afro-American of unsurpassed usefulness, and an exemplary citizen.

W. D. HOWELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED